DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 483 UD 016 897

AUTHOR Weinberg, Meyer
TITLE Minority Students: A Research Appraisal.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 396p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$20.75 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Achievement Rating; American Indians; Black Community; Blacks; Classroom Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Historical Reviews; *Integration Effects; Intelligence Factors; Learning; Legal Problems; *Minority Group Children; Minority Groups; Racial Composition; Racial Factors; *Research Reviews (Publications); Research Utilization; *School Integration; Spanish Speaking; *State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

This book presents a comprehensive review of research on minority students and desegregation. An interdisciplinary approach which covers all major approaches to the problem and which presents contrasting viewpoints on school integration and minority student education is used. Effecting change in the classroom and the schools is the central concern of this book. Beyond the usual exclusive concern with subject areas which can be manipulated statistically, this tome includes the perspectives of historians, lawyers, economists, and even non-specialists. Factors treated at some length include the historical and legal background of the education of minority groups, the ideology of racism, a continuing reexamination and questioning of prevailing views of the role of social class and race in learning, and the impact of minority communities upon the schools. Separate chapters deal with Spanish-surnamed and American Indian students. The impact of schooling is examined in the areas of academic achievement, self-concept and aspirations, and the relationships of students with their peers and with their teachers. The findings presented in a conclusion to this work indicate that desegregation works for both white and black children. It narrows the achievement gap between them. In addition, minority children gain a more realistic conception of their vocational and educational future through integrated settings. Positive racial attitudes by black and white students develop as they attend school together. This book is a companion volume to another book titled, "A Chance to Learn" which includes fuller documentation on the historical and legal materials that are cited in this volume. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED137483

MINORITY STUDENTS:
A RESEARCH APPRAISAL

Meyer Weinberg

MARCH 1977

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD016897

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
National Institute of Education

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

APR 1 1977

Table of Contents

		Page No.
	Foreword by Karl E. Taeuber	iii
	Preface	v
Chapter 1	The Historical Framework	1
Chapter 2	The Legal Framework	17
Chapter 3	Race and Intelligence in America	37
Chapter 4	The Possibilities of Learning	55
Chapter 5	Learning in the Classroom	77
Chapter 6	Desegregation and Achievement	95
Chapter 7	Being Black and Oneself	129
Chapter 8	Students and Fellow Students	181
Chapter 9	Teachers and Their Students	219
Chapter 10	The Black Community and the Schools	245
Chapter 11	Spanish-Speaking Children in School	285
Chapter 12	Indian American Children	307
Chapter 13	Conclusion	327
	Bibliography	333
	Table of Cases	381
	Index of Persons Cited	383
	Subject Index	393

The research report herein was developed under a contract from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that Agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.

FOREWORD

The 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* capped a long struggle through the courts to reverse the doctrine of separate but equal. The landmark decision clearly portended a period of deliberate massive change in schooling and in American race relations generally. Indeed the unanimous decision rendered by the newly appointed Chief Justice Warren has come to symbolize the beginning of an era of political, legislative, and judicial action towards civil rights.

The mid-1950's were also a time of rapidly increasing numbers of graduate students and recent doctorates with a penchant for publishing, and of increasing federal, state, and private funds devoted to research. In a spirit of optimism about the contribution that research could make to effective social change, educational researchers and social scientists issued calls for a concerted program of applied and basic research on school desegregation. The Supreme Court itself had led the way; its controversial footnote 11 in *Brown* cited seven social science studies to support the finding that segregation in public schools has a detrimental effect upon Negro children.

That an explosion in the volume of desegregation research occurred in the years following *Brown* cannot be denied. Professor Weinberg's earlier compilation, *"The Education of the Minority Child: A Comprehensive Bibliography of 10,000 Selected Entries,* testifies to the sheer quantity of material. Coherence and, in many instances, quality are another matter. Despite repeated pleas for a coordinated and systematic research effort, despite establishment of sundry desegregation assistance and research centers, and despite sporadic governmental and private conferences, symposia, and reports, the flood of publications roars on, largely unharnessed by those most in need of its power. Educational administrators in search of advice on how to desegregate effectively, attorneys in search of empirical information on complex issues of feasibility and effectiveness, social scientists in search of new knowledge from a vast national experiment in social change—all find themselves inundated. Only the polemicists float merrily along, seizing on a piece of flotsam here and a piece of jetsam there to demonstrate the verity of their own opinions.

Professor Weinberg is the nation's lighthouse in this rolling sea. *Integrated Education,* the journal he has edited since its inception in 1963, is a continuing review of news and scholarship on all facets of race and schooling. His bibliography cited above and two editions of *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal* have been treasured references. In this new book Professor Weinberg becomes not only our beacon and guide but also our interpreter.

Like most knowledgeable guides, Professor Weinberg is enchanted with side channels, eddies, and shoals as well as the main current, and the journey he takes us on is long and often intricate. But he knows the main channel and returns to it frequently.

Before taking Professor Weinberg's complete tour, the reader should look at the brief final chapter where he reports his broadest conclusions. Desegregation works. It works for black children and it works for white children. It works for academic achievement and it works for development of racial tolerance.

Other serious scholars may evaluate portions of the massive evidence differently, and may qualify some of these conclusions. Polemicists writing in journals of opinion or speaking in legislative halls will still be able to find among the thousands of studies some kind of seeming evidence for almost any opinion. No one can have the last word on such vital topics, and the studies and the scholarly debate and the polemics will continue. For those who genuinely wish to use evidence from educational and social science research, Professor Weinberg has accomplished two important tasks.

First he reminds us of the necessity of considering the totality of the evidence. Those who conduct research and those who interpret research should be obliged to come to terms with the rich heritage of prior work. We should all be skeptical of those who jump to startling or far-reaching conclusions on the basis of someone's latest study.

Second, he demonstrates the value of the accumulated treasure of studies as a source of practical advice. The moral and constitutional mandate to desegregate has long since been rendered. It is late in the century for trying to use research to reargue moral and legal imperatives. Rather we should use past studies and plan new studies to help us get on with the task at hand. How shall we go about desegregation to make it effective? What works, for whom, under what circumstances? What problems can be handled with what techniques? If Professor Weinberg succeeds in directing new attention to these questions, his effort will be another milestone on a difficult journey.

KARL E. TAEUBER
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin--MADISON

Preface

Originally, this book was to have been the third edition of *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal.*[1] In the process of writing, however, it has become an entirely new work. Both preceding volumes (1968, 1970) were essentially reports of research, written with a minimum of interpretation and a maximum of circumspection. Subjects beyond the areas covered by the respective researchers remained undiscussed. The result was a rather austere, abstract view of children in school.

The present volume places research on minority students in a broader framework than is customary. Factors treated at some length include historical and legal background, the ideology of racism, a continuing reexamination and questioning of prevailing views of the role of social class and race in learning, and the impact of minority communities upon the schools. Separate chapters deal with Spanish-surnamed and Indian American students. The impact of schooling is examined in the areas of academic achievement, self-conception and aspirations, and the relationships of students among themselves and with their teachers.

A comprehensive range of studies has been examined in an effort to cover all major approaches and represent contrasting viewpoints. Special value has been attached to studies that examine firsthand the ongoing reality of the classroom. Too often, theoretical studies proceed in virtual ignorance of this reality. Curiously, this failing is rarely commented on in the research literature.

Effecting change in the classroom and the school is the central concern of this book. The research materials were carefully screened for whatever light they might cast on this concern. As will become clear to the reader, research is beginning to uncover the increasing potential of school to change. The great problem of educational policy is to cultivate the practical promise of such research.

An interdisciplinary approach has been adopted throughout. Beyond the usual exclusive concern with subjects that can be manipulated statistically, the perspectives of historians, lawyers, economists, and even non-specialists have been enlisted. Viewed in the glare of many lights, the school appears differently from the image presented by orthodox research practitioners who have downgraded the autonomous role of the school.

Many of the sources reported here are rarely studied by conventional educational researchers. Journals published under minority auspices, for example, are almost never cited in the research literature. Legislative inquiries are an overlooked source except in studies of legal matters. The modern research capacity of lawmaking bodies should not be ignored. Similarly, with the rise of investigative journalism reliable and timely materials are being made available in various journals and newspapers that merit examination.

I am grateful to the National Institute of Education for affording me the opportunity to prepare the present publication. Thanks are due Will Riggan for initial arrangements, and Robert Lindquist, project officer, who facilitated the entire project from start to finish, with alacrity and grace.

A number of researchers made available unpublished work. Chapter 3 was read and criticized by Julie Ann Miller, Mark Furth, and I. I. Gottesman. Responsibility for the present contents of that chapter remains entirely mine, however.

The facilities of many libraries were utilized. Miss Margery Carpenter of the Inter-library Loan Department, Northwestern University Library, was exceedingly helpful. In addition, frequent use was made of the libraries at the University of Chicago, DePaul College of Law, Loop College, and Concordia College. The ERIC collection, which grows increasingly useful, helped locate a number of papers and studies that in the past would have remained unknown except to a chosen few. University Microfilms responded with promptness to orders for filmed dissertations from its recently completed index, which greatly simplifies the task of locating hitherto inaccessible materials. La Vern Rouse, Joyce Mirza, and Pearl Weiss typed the final manuscript.

---

[1] Meyer Weinberg, *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal* (Bloomington, Il.: Phi Delta Kappa 1968, 1970).

The present volume should be considered a companion work to another book to be published by the present writer: *A Chance to Learn*[2]. Much fuller documentation on historical and legal materials will be found there.

Readers of this book can be helpful to later editions in three ways: (1) by sending comments, critical or otherwise, on any error of omission or commission they may find; (2) by communicating any ideas for research along the lines treated here; and (3) by sending copies of their own work, projected or completed.

Meyer Weinberg
Center for Equal Education
Northwestern University
2003 Sheridan Road
Evanston, IL 60201
March 1975

---

[2] Meyer Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn* (New York: Cambridge University Press, in press).

CHAPTER 1
THE HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

The American common school arose on foundations of racial and ethnic exclusivism. This spirit was national rather than sectional, and it guided the behavior of political and community institutions as well. Higher education followed the same path.

For more than a century, minority parents sought to open the schools to their children. They used political and legal means as part of a broader struggle for equal civil and human rights. Only in contemporary times has this effort begun to approach fruition.

Historical perspective clarifies the focus on the present. It reveals both the burden and the promise of the past. Human institutions are only human. They arise in response to definite needs, shift as people change their ways, and make their contemporary appearance in perpetually transitional forms.

A people that gave birth to the world's first system of common schools can hardly be portrayed as passive recipients of their heritage. Today, the challenge is to make the schools truly universal and inclusive. The principal obstacles are institutional, and these institutions bear an historical character in part. These cannot be overcome by being ignored, no matter how clever or sophisticated the evasion.

BLACK EDUCATION UNTIL THE CIVIL WAR

In 1860, nearly 1.4 million Negro children under 10 years of age lived in the United States. Virtually none attended school.[1] While the school enrollment rate that year was 55 percent for white children, it was slightly less than 2 percent for blacks.[2] Almost all the latter were in the North.

IN THE SOUTH

Beginning with a law passed in 1740 in colonial South Carolina, the slave South enforced a policy of "compulsory ignorance". Under these enactments, it was made a crime to teach slaves to read or write. Frederick Douglass, the time-honored escaped slave and black abolitionist, observed in 1850 when 3.2 million slaves worked in the South, that "there is the greatest unanimity of opinion among the white population of the South in favor of the policy of keeping the slave in ignorance."[3]

About 250,000 free Negroes lived in the South –mostly in border States–in 1860. Few free black children were educated. Less than 4,000 attended public schools. An undetermined number in urban places attended secret schools–taught, for the most part, by whites. Soon after the beginning of the 19th century, many thousand black adults and children learned to read in Sabbath schools. By the 1830's as slaveowner sensitivity to abolitionist doctrine grew, these schools came under suspicion. Instruction in reading was stopped and replaced by oral instruction which stressed memorization. By 1840, only 1,459 blacks were enrolled in 15 Negro Sabbath schools all over the South.[4] Apprenticeship served for a time as another avenue for literacy, as long as masters implemented standard provisions requiring that the apprentice must be taught to read, write, and calculate. In North Carolina, apprenticeship was the dominant means whereby literacy was attained. During the first third of the century, however, the slave States legislated against such provisions. Specific occupations, such as printing, were closed off to blacks since literacy was required in their practice.[5] A handful of free blacks in Louisiana and Alabama were accorded school rights by virtue of stipulations in the treaty between France and the United States governing the Louisiana Purchase; similar provisions were part of the treaty between Spain and the United States concerning the acquisition of West Florida.

IN THE NORTH

By 1860, some 200,000 free Negroes lived in the North. Unattached to the plantation, they were the most mobile sector of the black people. Wherever they settled, they constituted an organized community. The search for educational opportunities was a communitywide project. As early as 1833, blacks in Philadelphia organized over 50 different voluntary associations "for their moral and intellectual improvement".[6] Yet, the life of blacks in that city was hard. Their children were excluded from the public schools. In Cleveland, on the other hand, many of the blacks had been free Negroes in the South and had accumulated some capital. The schools of Cleveland were open to all. In rural areas, black communities organized private schools, sometimes with the aid of the Society of Friends. Negroes in Connecticut faced difficult conditions. In 1859, John T. Waugh, an escaped slave, then resident in Providence, R.I., told a Convention of Colored Persons that "when he was a slave in the South, and attempted to gain his freedom, he had no idea of living to see his son excluded from a Rhode Island school."[7]

During the 40 years after the American Revolution, roughly from 1790 to 1830, private schools for Negro children were built by blacks in fewer than a dozen cities. Although wealthy white abolitionists occasionally contributed money, the facilities remained exceedingly minimal. Publicly funded schools were all but unavailable for black children. Hostile whites often set fire to black schools. In Ohio, however, "if one (school) house was burned, another was put up in its place."[8]

In the course of the 1820's, black parents began to see the fruits of their agitation for opening the public schools. Boston school authorities permitted a single all-black public school in 1820. In Ohio, the common school law of 1829 explicitly excluded Negro children from its benefits. Black parents fought to change the law; not until the 1850's did the legislature permit all-black public schools. During the decade 1853-1862 Negro enrollment in these schools rose tenfold from 702 to 7,456.[9] In neighboring Pennsylvania, the same decade saw the legislature grant black parents limited access to public schools, although in segregated circumstances.

Negro parents accepted segregated schools if these were the price of any education. During the 1840's and 1850's, however, many black communities rebelled against what they called "caste schools". They rejected segregation of schools as well as the separation of children by race inside the school.[10] Mass meetings, door-to-door canvassing, and legislative lobbying were some of the techniques employed.[11]

School finance was racially discriminatory. Even with blacks excluded from the public schools, they were still required to pay school taxes. Such was the case in Illinois, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Rhode Island, and other States. Blacks in those States were taxed for the benefit of white children. As Frederick Douglass declared: "In the northern States, we are not slaves to individuals, not personal slaves, yet in many respects we are the slaves of the community."[12] A more basic inequity arose from the fact that both slaves and free Negroes were enumerated when a territory applied for statehood. Part of the statehood process was a large-scale Federal land grant for the exclusive purpose of financing common schools. Between 1803 and 1864, more than 27 million acres of Federal lands were given to the States for schools.[13] In the South, no slave children and virtually no free Negro children were permitted to share the benefit of these funds. In a number of northern States, black children were similarly shortchanged.

The Civil War created the conditions for fundamental change. Nearly 200,000 blacks had fought for their freedom. After the war, for the first time in two and a half centuries, blacks were free to explore and consolidate their own way of life. That way rested on economic security, equal citizenship, and education.

BLACK EDUCATION, 1865-1950

The movement to educate the freedmen and their children, wrote DuBois, "started with the

Negroes themselves and they continued to form the dynamic force behind it."[14] Freedmen built and owned numerous schools all over the South. By 1870, in Virginia alone, 111 schools were owned outright and another 215 supported in part by freedmen.[15] Northern missionary groups contributed money, teaching materials, and—most important—teachers. Between 1866 and 1870, the Freedmen's Bureau supplemented the private efforts of freedmen and missionaries with aid in building schools. Even then, freedmen paid for one-half to two-thirds of the cost of schooling.[16] White public opinion in the South was almost uniformly hostile towards these schools. Many were burned to the ground and their teachers mistreated.[17]

By 1870, 9 out of 10 school-age Negro children were still not in school. The key to expanded opportunity lay in opening the public schools to Negro children. The decade of the 1870's saw a gigantic step forward toward this goal, as follows:[18]

	Number of Negro Children Age 5-19 (000)	Negro Enrollment Rate (Percent of age group)	White Enrollment Rate (Percent of age group)	Number of Negro Children in School (000)	Number of Negro Children Not in School (000)
1860	1,741.0	1.9	59.6	33.1	1,708.0
1870	1,825.7	9.9	54.4	180.7	1,645.0
1880	2,531.7	33.8	62.0	885.7	1,676.0

This progress rested on a powerful political base that freedmen had constructed. Throughout the South, black political power was used to create and/or pry open public school systems for all children. In a number of States, school expenditures per child were roughly equal as between black and white. In Mississippi, the attendance rate for black children exceeded the rate for white children.[18]

The close of the Reconstruction period brought an abrupt end to black power, and thereby to school progress. Between 1880 and 1900, blacks were deprived of the right to vote, terrorized into acquiescence after decades of violence, and forced into a shadowland of civic existence. School expansion became a thing of the past for blacks; in 1880, their enrollment rate had been 33.8 percent; in 1900, it was 31.1 percent. Per pupil expenditures became lopsided. South Carolina in the mid-1870's spent equal amounts for black and white schools. By 1895, per pupil expenditures for white schools were nearly triple those in black schools.[19]

During the first 30 years of the 20th century, planned deprivation of black education in the South was joined with compulsory segregation. By refusing to build sufficient schools for black children, the State ensured that a disproportionate part of State aid would accrue to the white schools. State aid was based on a census of school-age children; the lower attendance of black children created a "surplus" of unspent State aid that was then used for the benefit of the white schools, thus compounding the initial inequity.

Segregation of schools created an organizational framework for transferring public funds in a racially discriminatory way. Every aspect of schools reflected this systematic process. From 1900 to 1930, the school year for blacks increased from 57 to 97 days, while that for whites more than doubled. Teachers in black schools taught from a third to three-quarters more children than teachers in white schools; and the ratio of black to white teacher salaries dropped from 86 percent in 1899-1900 to 52 percent in 1920.[20] Educational innovations were reserved for whites; in Atlanta during 1925, the public schools operated 40 kindergartens for white children, but none for blacks.[21] From 1924 to 1926, the State of Mississippi built 48 white agricultural high schools for whites, but only one for blacks.[22] In 1934, Horace Mann Bond wrote that Negro children "receive a smaller proportion of public funds in the Southern States than they have at any time in past history."[23]

After the Civil War, blacks suddenly started moving to cities in the South, but this stream slowed by 1870. Nevertheless, between 1880 and

1920, the number of blacks in 25 southern cities rose from 368,000 to 924,000. In general, educational opportunities for Negro children were better in the cities than on the countryside. Yet, during a 10-year period of migration, 1908-1918, a number of southern counties tended to reduce black teachers' salaries as the black enrollment rose. This facilitated the transfer of black school appropriations to white schools.[24] At the same time, more children enrolled in and completed elementary schools; thus, the migrations within the South increased pressures for the building of secondary schools for black children. By 1928-1929, fewer than 4 percent of all accredited high schools in the South were open to black children.[25]

Blacks in the North were predominantly urban. Their children had more schooling opportunities than did blacks in the South. In 1910, 84.2 percent of northern black children aged 6-14 were in school, as compared with 57.9 percent of southern black children.

Segregation was a fact of life, if not of law, in northern schools. Black parents fought against separate schools in most cases. By 1920, as the northward migration begun during World War I broadened, nearly 750,000 Negroes lived in 15 northern cities. New York City became the leading black city in the country; Philadelphia was second, outstripping all southern cities; and Chicago was third, containing almost as many blacks as Washington, D.C., the largest black city in the South.

In Chicago, during the Civil War, the school board had created racially separate schools, but black parents refused to send their children and separation was abolished at war's end. In many Illinois districts, school taxes were collected from Negro taxpayers, but their children were excluded from the schools. After World War I, segregation in racially changing neighborhoods in Chicago was maintained by building second-rate branch schools near the main building.[26] The number of black teachers was strictly controlled and a racially discriminatory policy of teacher assignment was followed.[27] During the 1930's and 1940's, numerous black children attended schools on a double shift while white children had a full day of school.[28]

In New York City, the influx of southern Negroes during the 1920's challenged the school system, which responded variously. P.S. 89 in Harlem, 93 percent black in 1920, reportedly sent all but 10 percent of its graduates on to high school.[29] P.S. 119, three-quarters black in 1920, responded by instituting prevocational subjects, such as "millinery, dressmaking, practical homemaking, industrial art, and cooking."[30] Black parents complained about racially derogatory material in textbooks, but little was done to remedy the situation.[31] By the early 1930's, overcrowding had become extreme; yet, no new schools were built in Harlem. The absence of blacks on the school board became a community issue during the 1930's. In the middle of the decade, an official report contained this comment: "It seems that many of the white teachers appointed to the schools of Harlem regard the appointment as a sort of punishment ... There appears to be a great deal of turnover in white personnel in these schools."[32] The LaGuardia administration suppressed the report of a committee of its own choosing that was highly critical of city school policies in Harlem.

In New Jersey, State school authorities regularly violated laws and court decisions that outlawed segregated schools.[33] During the mid-1920's, many of the State's elementary schools were segregated. In 1925, a researcher reported:

> From the university town of Princeton, including the capital city of Trenton, southward to Cape May, every city or town with a considerable Negro population supports the dual educational system, with a building for its white and a building for its Negro pupils of the grammar grades ... In no town south of Elizabeth does a colored teacher have a class with white children in it, though wholly colored classes are sometime found with a white teacher in charge.[34]

An inquiry initiated by the State legislature 14 years later found conditions had worsened. Segregation had spread and a deterioration of educational conditions set in.[35]

Thus, in the North, school officials were not often eager to translate legal rights of Negro children into classroom realities. Black parents were the primary enforcers of these rights which were sought through organized collective action.[36] The initiative for the creation of segregated schools in the North usually lay with school districts, given the appearance of legality by State complicity.

Black migration to urban areas, both North and South, necessarily involved the problem of housing. During 1910-1916, many southern cities passed ordinances decreeing compulsory residential segregation. These were outlawed by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1917. Within the real estate industry, the racial regulation of housing was viewed as an economic necessity. Under the leadership of the Chicago Real Estate Board during the 1920's, techniques were perfected to segregate cities further along racial lines. Nationwide patterns of segregation were enforced by the National Association of Real Estate Boards. The block-by-block pattern of ghetto expansion was created and maintained by the real estate practice of refusing to sell or rent housing on a block to a Negro unless at least one Negro already lived there.

These efforts were remarkably successful. As the following table indicates, residential segregation in northern cities increased sharply between 1910 and 1930.[38] (The index of residential segregation expresses the degree to which Negroes would have to be redistributed over a city in order to achieve in each census tract or ward the same racial ratio as prevails in the city as a whole. The greater the segregation, the higher the index number.)

Indexes of Residential Segregation
Between Negroes and Native Whites,
10 Northern Cities, 1910 and 1930

	1910	1930
Boston	64.1	77.9
Buffalo	62.6	80.5
Chicago	66.8	85.2
Cincinnati	47.3	72.8
Cleveland	60.6	85.0
Columbus	31.6	62.8
Philadelphia	46.0	63.4
Pittsburgh	44.1	61.4
St. Louis	54.3	82.1
Syracuse	64.0	86.7

Northern schools adjusted to these demographic changes in fairly uniform ways. Attendance areas were redrawn to separate black from white children. In rapidly changing areas, school boards often created optional attendance areas to enable white parents to select schools in accordance with the most recent racial statistics. The grade span of predominantly black schools was sometimes extended so as to prevent children in these schools from passing on to a nearby advanced white school. At times, Negro students were placed in a separate wing of a school or annex or in a separate room, even in the basement. Schools designed for black students were located in the growing number of solidly black residential areas. In order to minimize protest at these measures from occurring within the school systems, blacks were not appointed to school boards and higher managerial posts.[39]

BLACK EDUCATION SINCE THE 1930'S

CHANGE IN THE SOUTH

During the late 1930's, black teachers introduced a new dynamic into southern education when they began a series of legal actions to achieve equal pay for equal work. Uniformly, courts ruled in their favor; thus, equalization of teacher salaries became the first occasion for the practice of anything near equality of black and white schooling in the South. Between 1939-1940 and 1953-1954, the ratio of black teachers' salaries to those of teachers in southern white schools increased from 57 to 85 percent. Since instructional expense is the largest part of total school expenditures, per pupil expenditures during the same years increased significantly. Over the same period, the ratio of black to white per pupil expenditures rose from 32 to 61 percent.[40] This permitted the almost total elimination of the differential length of school term. In 1939-1940, Negro schools ran 156 days; all white schools, 175 days. By 1953-1954, the figures were 177 and 179. Average days of attendance at the earlier year were 126 and 152; at the later years, 151 and 159.[41]

The basic pattern of discrimination remained undiminished if no longer undisturbed. Decades of deliberate deprivation had created such enormous black-white disparities that recent advances did little to reduce the size of the absolute gap. Between 1939 and 1952, while the gap of current expenditures per pupil in six southern States narrowed from 57.3 to 30.3 percent, the size of the actual gap in dollars was reduced from $53.85 only to $50.15.[42] In Mississippi, which schooled a 10th of the South's black children, 95 percent of all the single-teacher schools during 1953-1954 were black. The speaker of Mississippi's House of Representatives acknowledged in 1954 that "in the past we actually have not maintained a dual system of schools financially. We have maintained a white system."[43]

In 1954, the U. S. Supreme Court handed down its decision in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* that racially separate schools were inherently unequal. (*Brown* is discussed in detail in the following chapter.) Not only did the decision go unenforced in the Deep South–the system of discriminatory expenditures also continued. Arkansas in 1961 spent 23 percent more for each white pupil than for each black pupil.[44] During 1957, per pupil expenditures on whites averaged 14 percent higher in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.[45] The number of accredited high schools for blacks continued to lag severely behind those for whites, even in the same communities. Funds for construction of black schools, presumably to demonstrate that quality of education could rise under segregation, made few inroads on the basic inequality. In the South as a whole, percentage increases in building expenditures for blacks exceeded those for whites in the mid-1950's. But, as one observer reported: "Despite the superiority of Negro percentages increases, actual total values reported for 1955-56 and in 1956-57 show that white plant value totals remained greatly superior."[46]

Change came from currents stirred by the organized civil rights movement. In the late 1950's, localized black protests against segregation began the process. It was, however, the student "sit-in" movement, begun in 1960, that upset dramatically the state of quietude in school practices. Black college and high school students became the mainsprings of social change in the South. During the early 1960's, they led in registering blacks to vote. Southern Negroes, it will be recalled, had gained initial entry into the public schools nearly a century earlier via political power. The voter registration campaign was the prelude to bringing such power to bear on the broadest range of civic rights.

CHANGE IN THE NORTH

Black children in the North attended essentially segregated schools which were systematically inferior to white schools in the same communities. As in the past, school boards, with varying degrees of deliberateness, perpetuated and extended racial lines in schools. In Detroit, for example, a member of the board of education testified in 1961 on its practice of changing school boundaries as the racial composition of the attendance area changed; in this way, black and white children were strictly separated.[47] In one northern city after another, black achievement scores lagged behind white scores. (See Chapter 6, for a detailed discussion of this subject.)

From 1960 to 1964, blacks in New York City built a strong protest movement against segregation and ineffective education. Puerto Ricans joined in, as well as some whites. School boycotts were the principal technique of protest. The school board, besides issuing statements favoring integration, failed to adopt a program of action to meet parents' protests. In Chicago, during the same years, a similar movement arose. More so than in New York City, segregation in Chicago became a central issue. Large-scale protest actions erupted in Boston, Cleveland, Gary, and many other northern cities.[48] Little immediate change in specific educational practices resulted from mass protests. In the long run, however, the protest movement schooled many thousand minority students and parents in the problems of effecting change in modern urban school systems. School protests became intertwined with issues of political representation, housing, public accommodations, and others. The emergence of a community control movement is easier to understand in the context of a decade of increasing civic participation around the segregated schools issue.

BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION

BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

Black participation in higher education during its first two centuries of history was almost imperceptible. By 1865, fewer than 30 blacks had graduated from an American college or university. More had attended without graduating. Many more were excluded from initial entry. Among the institutions which refused to accept black students were Princeton University, Wesleyan University in Connecticut, Brown University, and Union College.[49] Harvard Medical School admitted three blacks in 1850, but ejected them after a year. White students insisted on their expulsion. After some hesitation, the faculty agreed.[50] Oberlin College and Antioch College, founded in 1833 and 1852, respectively, both accepted Negro students. During the 1840's and 1850's, some four to five percent of total enrollment at Oberlin was black.[51]

CIVIL WAR TO 1919: SOUTH

During the half-century after the Civil War, the characteristic American college was a small, mediocre, private institution of doubtful durability, which only moderately saw its purpose as the promotion of scholarship, which enrolled both collegiate and secondary school students, and which, in great measure, hewed to the color line.

Since southern governments refused to contribute public funds for black higher education, the initiative lay with northern missionary groups, joined later on by black church groups in the South. The American Missionary Association (AMA) was foremost in supplying facilities and teaching personnel. Its supporters hoped to establish colleges open to the poor of all races. That the schools ultimately became *Negro* colleges was a matter of external political pressure, not original design. One cost they had to pay because of the pressure was a series of distortions and exaggerations of structure. Around the turn of the century, somewhat more than one-quarter of all American college students were, in fact, enrolled in precollegiate programs. In the black colleges, however, about nine-tenths of the enrollment consisted of preparatory students.[52] The dearth of public high schools for Negroes largely accounted for the difference. Poverty forced the black colleges to cut corners in every aspect of operation. Nevertheless, until 1900, at least 2,330 blacks graduated from American colleges, more than four-fifths from black colleges.[53]

Meaningful public support for black higher education had seemed a realistic possibility in 1862 when Congress passed the Morrill Act. Each State was given funds to set up land-grant colleges. The States chose to use the funds almost exclusively for white students. Under the second Morrill Act, of 1890, the receipt of Federal funds was made dependent on a State pledge that these would be "equitably divided" between blacks and whites.

The new Morrill black land-grant colleges were severely handicapped by southern governments. In 1881-1882, Georgia, for example, appropriated some $14,000 for white colleges and $8,000 for a black college. By 1913-1914, the support for white public colleges had risen to $539,000 while that for the black college remained unchanged.[54] When the new colleges attempted to adopt liberal arts programs, State authorities vetoed the effort. They were maintained as trade schools. After a decade of the second Morrill Act, expenditures on white land-grant colleges exceeded those for black ones by a ratio of approximately 26 to one.[55]

BLACK HIGHER SCHOOLING IN THE NORTH TO 1910

Between 1876 and 1900, some 13 blacks a year graduated from northern colleges or universities, one-third from Oberlin alone. While racial restrictions appeared even at Oberlin during these years, at other schools outright exclusion was the rule. Amherst College's president George Harris wrote in 1900 that he advised blacks against attending a northern college: "The color line is so sharply drawn ... unfortunately ... that a Negro is at a great disadvantage, not in studies, but socially."[56] Princeton continued to turn away all black applicants; Vassar strongly advised blacks not to come; South Dakota State College reported "the attitude towards Negro students is not favorable with the student body."[57] In 1915, Rutgers admitted its third Negro student in 149 years. This student, the late Paul Robeson, was an unbelievable combination of intellectual brilliance, musical and dramatic talent, and athletic prowess—unmatched by his white classmates. In 1913, DuBois reported that northern colleges had for the past decade been discouraging Negro attendance. At Cornell University, he wrote, they were being excluded from dormitories; Columbia University and the University of Chicago were accused of trying to minimize the number of Negro students in their summer sessions.[58]

Near the eve of World War I, black America had established a tradition of higher education. The private black college was its principal avenue. About 4,000 Negroes had been graduated; one-sixth were women. The recency of the achievement is underscored by the fact that fully 70 percent of the graduates had completed their courses since 1890. Eight black colleges—six in the South, two in the North—accounted for half of the graduates.

NEGRO COLLEGES, 1910-1930

From 1914 to 1931, enrollment in the black colleges nearly doubled while the number of students in collegiate-level courses grew by nearly 1,700 percent. By 1931, collegiate-level enrollment constituted 60 percent of total enrollment. Financially, the colleges were extremely weak. Even after several decades of special effort, in 1925 more than 70 percent of total endowment of black colleges was in only two institutions–Hampton Institute and Tuskegee Institute. Both had attracted comparatively large gifts from foundations and individuals on the basis of their industrial, not collegiate, curricula.

Educational standards remained low, even as enrollment expanded. Library facilities and laboratory equipment were most scanty. Buildings were often located in areas unsuited to their purpose; the range of curricula was exceedingly narrow; some colleges lacked even a catalog. Southern State governments made few or no efforts to encourage black colleges to seek accreditation, one reason being the necessary expenditure of public funds if the goal were attained. The Georgia State department of education acknowledged in the mid-1920's that "while the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools are rigidly adhered to in accrediting white universities and colleges ... it [i.e., Georgia] does not strictly enforce these requirements in granting recognition to Negro higher educational institutions."[59]

Black educators petitioned in vain for accreditation. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools refused to consider the requests since to grant accreditation, even after onsite examination of the colleges, would ordinarily require the newly accredited college to be admitted as a member of the all-white association. In 1930, the association devised a new category–"approved", rather than "accredited"–and applied it to seven black colleges. The new category was widely understood to imply that accreditation standards "were being watered down when applied to the Negro schools."[60] Not until 1961 could black colleges become fully accredited and equal members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Traditionally, students in black colleges had been subjected to a severe regimen of personal conduct and close scrutiny of their political thought. Both were aspects of white control of their institutions. Located, as were so many black colleges, in a predominantly white countryside or town, their students were under eternal watch. Being on one's best behavior was interpreted by black college administrators as meaning self-subjection to quasimilitary regulation. Political orthodoxy was not less highly valued by dominant white society. Langston Hughes, the poet, after touring 50 Negro colleges and high schools in 1932, complained that many of the colleges were "doing their best to produce spineless Uncle Toms, uninformed, and full of mental and moral evasions."[61]

NEGROES IN NORTHERN COLLEGES, 1915-1945

Between 1910 and 1940, the black population of the North rose from 1.1 million to nearly 3.0 million. This growth and, more important, the greater accessibility of secondary schools brought about increasing black enrollment in northern colleges and universities.

While most colleges generally opened their doors to Negro applicants, exceptions were widespread. The University of Dayton officially excluded blacks from day classes–in deference to numerous southern white students–while Skidmore College accepted blacks only as day students.[62] The University of Cincinnati excluded Negroes from its schools of medicine and engineering; in 1928, Northwestern University began to exclude them from its school of medicine.[63] Quota systems were frequently imposed. Butler University had an annual quota of 10 blacks while the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School admitted only two blacks each year.[64] In a study published in 1948, Roche found that "at least 22 Catholic colleges and universities totally excluded Negroes ..."[65] Seventeen years earlier, three Catholic institutions–Holy Cross, Notre Dame, and Worcester College–barred blacks.[66]

The number of black college students in the North grew from 1,400 in 1924 to 2,538 in 1932. Enrollment was highly concentrated. In 1928 half of the black students attended 10 colleges–five of them public, five private. Ohio State University was the most popular during the 1920's and 1930's. While both North and South exchanged black students, the North was a net exporter to the South.

Once enrolled in college, blacks were sometimes excluded from specific curricula, especially from medicine. Black practice teachers from predominantly white universities were rejected by local public school systems in Philadelphia, St. Paul, and Oberlin, Ohio.[67]

Black students were most often excluded from living in oncampus college dormitories. In 1931, institutions practicing such exclusion included numerous State universities (Indiana, Iowa, Arizona, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Pennsylvania) and better known private colleges such as Bryn Mawr, Macalester, Temple, and Villanova.[68] Some universities refused to permit black women to live in the dormitories while extending the privilege to Negro men. This was the case at the University of Chicago and Ohio State University.

Eating facilities were frequently closed to black students. In the late 1930's, according to a U. S. Office of Education study:

> On some campuses the public eating places were open to all students alike; on other campuses only certain places were open; on one campus separate booths or tables were set aside for Negro students ... In some instances there were almost no public eating places in the city to which the Negro students were admitted...[69]

College administrations not only enforced the exlusion on campus, but also apparently failed to protest the offcampus discrimination.

Racial considerations permeated intercollegiate athletics. From shortly before World War I well into the 1930's, a college team customarily benched a black player if the opposing team protested his presence.[70] Racial exclusion was policed by the intercollegiate athletic conferences. When in 1913 the University of Nebraska refused to bench a black football player at the demand of the University of Kansas team, the Missouri Valley Conference apparently added its pressure. Nebraska resigned from the conference in protest.[71] Such fortitude was extremely rare.

Intramural athletics were marked by even stricter segregation. Black women were barred almost everywhere from swimming with their white classmates, specifically at the universities of Iowa and Cincinnati. The University of Kansas prohibited both black men and women from intramural swimming. Basketball and wrestling were virtually white preserves.

Student social activities were segregated with the affirmative support of college administrations. "...The attitude of the Northern institutions toward the Negro student," wrote DuBois in 1926, "is one which varies from tolerance to active hostility."[72] The president of a college in the Ku Klux Klan belt of Ohio explained that while black and while students were welcome to attend all official college social functions, including the president's reception, "we would not like to require either group to admit the other to their respective social functions, dances, etc., for no benefit would likely result."[73] A dean of a university in Iowa "stated that colored students are welcome to the university and to all that it offers, but that they must not expect the university to solve the race problem."[74]

Black students protested against the regime of discrimination. They organized collectively for both fellowship and self-defense. Turned away from the white sororities and fraternities, they began in 1906–at Cornell University–to form black organizations. Greek letter groups for blacks sprang up even where the number of potential members was small. Excluded from all-campus interfraternity councils, the black groups existed at the margin of campus affairs, but central to the needs and interests of their members. They were a ra[illegible]uge for blacks on white campuses.

The maintenance of all-white faculties was an impregnable policy of northern colleges and universities. As of 1941, not a single full-time black classroom teacher, tenured or untenured, taught in a northern institution of higher education.[75] Lack of qualified applicants was not the problem. In 1936, a sizable group of black Ph.D's was available for employment, but fully 80 percent of them taught in three black institutions: Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard Universities.[76]

Black college students in the North valued highly the accessibility of a black community. Here could be found housing quarters, meals, leads on possible student employment, and relaxation. The colleges had almost no impact on the black communities. Very few black youngsters enrolled, even in the case of colleges located in cities of large black population. The first Negro student at the University of Pennsylvania, located in Philadelphia, entered in 1879; both his parents were foreign-born. Blacks were excluded from working in these colleges. In 1935, when nearly half a million Negroes lived in New York City, not one was employed as teacher or clerk in the College of the City of New York. The same was true, apparently, at other parts of the municipal institution.[77] Blacks were thus subjected to a rigid negative employment quota of 100 to 0, which enforced by an affirmative action program on behalf of segregation.

BLACK GRADUATE STUDY, 1865-1945

In 1930, public higher education institutions in the South enrolled over 11,000 white students in graduate and professional study. At the same time, not a single Negro in the South was receiving such State-supported training.[78] When a Presidential commission on higher education reported the next year, only a minority statement, written by three black college presidents, emphasized the insufficiency of higher–including professional–education facilities for Negroes.[79] Federal grants to the States for research were channeled without exception to white State colleges.[80] Faculty and students in black colleges were unable to utilize grants for research and advanced training.

During the decade following 1935, a number of court decisions opened the doors of heretofore white public higher institutions to a few individual black applicants. (The legal aspects of these cases are discussed in the next chapter.) To keep the number at a minimum, State legislatures established overnight "graduate schools" at black colleges. Their meagerness was consciously designed. But, meanwhile for the most part, southern white university educators had only models of graduate study at their own institutions.[81]

BLACK HIGHER EDUCATION SINCE 1945

In the South

Black-white inequalities in southern higher education institutions far exceeded racial differentials in the common schools. In 1955, the following per student ratios of white to black existed in southern public higher education:[82]

6-1	Number of higher institutions
8-1	Degrees conferred
9-1	Enrollment
10-1	Value of buildings and grounds
11-1	Library expenditures
11-1	Current income
16-1	Preparation of faculty
18-1	Library volumes

During the following decade, some of these differentials abated; others grew less favorable. From 1959 to 1969, the endowment of black colleges fell from three-fifths to one-half that of white colleges; black colleges also received a declining Federal contribution to their income, while Federal support was rising for white colleges.[83] Per student outlay for black colleges, however, increased sharply during the 1960's.

Approaching the 1970's, black colleges as a whole were comparable with white colleges in the same region and similar size. Other than in buildings, grounds, and equipment, black colleges offered about the same educational opportunities as their peer white institutions.[84] The drawing power of black colleges held up well. From 1953 to 1967, their enrollment more than doubled. By 1967, half of all black college students attended other than a traditionally black college. This tendency reflected the growing political power of blacks which–as a century earlier–helped force open the doors of public institutions hitherto closed. A growing majority of middle class blacks were bypassing the traditional black private college in favor of former all-white colleges.[85] As a consequence, the black colleges were faced with educating students who came predominantly from economically poor homes and required special financial help. While the black colleges had scored heroic achievements, they continued to be faced by historic patterns of inequality, virtually unrelieved by government.[86]

In the North

The issue of racial discrimination in colleges and universities became national for the first time in 1947 on release of a report by the President's Commission on Higher Education. It singled out for attack "the prevalence of quota systems and policies of exclusion". With reference to minority students enrolled in colleges, the Commission declared that "the frustrations of social discrimination–in the dormitories, in honorary societies, in fraternities and sororities, on athletic teams, and at social functions–strike at ... [their] personal dignity."[87] An end to segregation laws was advocated; this recommendation brought on a dissent by a minority of the Commission.

In 1948, members of the Association of American Colleges debated the issue at the group's annual meeting. While the association acknowledged that "many colleges discriminate against minority racial and religious groups", it opposed laws against discrimination as an infringement of the freedom of the independent college.[88] Discriminatory patterns lingered in many cases for two more decades.

American universities in the North and South averaged between two and three percent black attendance by 1970. In higher education as a whole–including black colleges–the figure fluctuated from just over 4.5 percent to a high of 5.8 percent. Predominantly white institutions sought out the most obviously talented black high school graduates while ignoring the others. More black youths appeared on university campuses. But with respect to percent of high school graduates entering college, the black-white gap grew:[89]

Ratio of high school graduates
entering college, 1963-1968

Year	Non-white percent	White percent	Gap percent
1963	38.1	45.6	7.5
1968	46.2	56.6	10.4

Since "non-whites" also includes Asians, it is likely that the actual gap for blacks and whites was even larger than indicated here.

Blacks were enrolled disproportionately in community colleges. By 1973, two-fifths of all black college students attended them while 25 percent went to traditional black colleges and 35 percent were in traditionally white 4-year colleges. The academic significance of high community college enrollments was difficult to establish. First, the basic numerical data were exceedingly defective.[90] Second, the graduation rate of community college students was only half that of senior college students of comparable ability.[91] Third, the dropout rate of black community college students was more than twice that of all community college students.[92]

Rising black enrollment in predominantly white institutions did not automatically cause oncampus discrimination to disappear. In the early 1960's, official housing discrimination existed at the University of Chicago, Rutgers, and Indiana University.[93] Student protests brought an end to these practices. Financial aid became a crucial student service when black and other minority students enrolled. Outright grants were relatively unavailable for poorer students whose aid consisted more of pay for working in school-connected employment. When Federal aid funds slumped during the early 1970's, black enrollment apparently also dropped. Few colleges and universities provided aid from their permanent budget. Aid to minority students tended to be viewed as a "special" expenditure.

Racial restrictions on college athletics fell away during the 1950's and 1960's as a result of civil rights pressure and the example of growing black involvement in professional sports. Little initiative came from the colleges themselves. With wider black participation, however, came new forms of discrimination. Black players were not given coaching positions; nor did the athletic conferences employ more than token numbers of blacks.[94] On northern and southern campuses a sense of estrangement pervaded social activities involving black and white students. Whether at the University of Georgia or the University of Illinois, black students were given to feel they did not "belong".[95]

Black faculty started to make their appearance at predominantly white campuses. In 1941, the first full-time black professor was employed at a virtually all-white institution. He was anthropologist Allison Davis, whose salary at the University of Chicago was paid by the Rosenwald Fund. Seven years later, however, the university's sociology department refused to employ Professor E. Franklin Frazier, eminent black sociologist. William F. Ogburn, departmental chairman, explained to a colleague that the appointment was not possible because the wives of white professors would object.[96] Not until the late 1960's did colleges begin to feel even slight pressure from the Federal Government to employ minority faculty. After 5 years of such pressure, the results were exceedingly minimal.

By 1970, more than a third of a million black young people were enrolled full time in higher education. They were distributed by field as follows:[97]

	Number	Percent of total
Undergraduate	344,819	6.9
Graduate	16,334	4.2
Medicine	1,752	4.1
Dentistry	570	3.8
Law	2,454	3.9
	365,929	6.7

Over the previous century, blacks had succeeded in creating a tradition of higher education. This was achieved in the face of a powerful structure of deprivation constructed by government and the learned professions.

FOOTNOTES

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1905* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 166.

[2] Data in U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States. Colonial Times to 1957* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 10-11 and 213-214. These figures express the enrollment rate per 100 in the age-group 5-19 years.

[3] *North Star*, December 5, 1850 in Philip S. Foner (ed.), *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, Vol. II: *Pre-Civil War Decade, 1850-1860* (New York: International, 1950), p. 136.

[4] Carter G. Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1919), p. 185.

[5] See *ibid.*, p. 167 and Charles S. Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1933), p. 53.

[6] William Lloyd Garrison in *Liberator*, July 13, 1833.

[7] *Liberator*, August 26, 1859.

[8] Charles T. Hickock, *The Negro in Ohio, 1802-1870* (Cleveland, Ohio: Williams Publishing and Electric Co., 1896), p. 90.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[10] For examples of inschool discrimation, see Josephine Brown to Samuel J. May, April 27, 1854 in Carter G. Woodson (ed.), *The Mind of the Negro As Reflected in Letters Written During the Crisis 1800-1860* (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926), p. 364; Robert H. Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America. A Documentary History*, I: *1600-1865* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), p. 445; and H. Easton, *A Treatise on the Intellectual Character and Civil and Political Condition of the Colored People of the United States; and the Prejudice Exercised Towards Them..* (Boston, Mass.: Issac Knapp, 1837,) p. 41

[11] See, for example, *Liberator*, August 2, 1844 and Arthur O. White, "Mid-Nineteenth Century Movements for Desegregated Schools in Six Northern Communities", *Integrated Education*, 10 (November-December 1972).

[12] *Liberator*,, October 27, 1848.

[13] Calculated from data in Paul W. Gates, with a chapter by Robert W. Swenson, *History of Public Land Law Development* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, November 1968), p. 804.

[14] W. E. B. DuBois, "Reconstruction and Its Benefits", *American Historical Review*, (1909-1910), p. 782.

[15] Alreutheus Ambush Taylor, *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia* (Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926), p. 142.

[16] Marjorie Holloman Parker, *The Educational Activities of the Freedmen's Bureau* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951), p. 93.

[17] See, for example, Frederick Douglass, *New National Era*, April 6, 1871 in Foner, *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, IV, pp. 242-243; Vernon L. Wharton, *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890* (New York: Harper and Row 1965 reprint), p. 245; and Lawrence D. Rice, *The Negro In Texas, 1874-1900* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1971), p. 211.

[18] Wharton, *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890*, p. 246.

[19] George Brown Tindall, *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1952), p. 216.

[20] Finis Welch, "Education and Racial Discrimination," June 1972, pp. 21-22 (unpublished).

[21] W. A. Daniel, "Schools," p. 215 in T. J. Woofter, Jr. (ed.), *Negro Problems in Cities* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Doran, 1928).

[22] W. E. B. DuBois, "The Negro Common School in Mississippi," *Crisis*, (September 1926), p. 92.

[23] Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon Press, 1966, reprint), p. 171.

[24] Thomas Jackson Woofter, Jr., *Negro Migration* (New York: Gray, 1920), pp. 165-166.

[25] Commission on Secondary Schools, *Progress and Plans of Negro High Schools Toward Regional Accreditment* (N.p.: Association of Colleges and Secondary schools for Negroes, 1945), p. iii.

[26] Allen H. Spear, *Black Chicago. The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 205.

[27] See Mary J. Herrick, *Negro Employees of the Chicago Board of Education* (Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1931), pp, 12-13, 18, 19, 32, 34, 35, and 246.

[28] Mary J. Herrick, *The Chicago Schools. A Social and Political History* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1971), p. 223, and St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City, I (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), p. 44.*

[29] *New York Age*, January 17, 1920.

[30] *New York Age*, January 10, 1920.

[31] *New York Age*, March 4, 1922.

[32] Quoted in Celia Lewis Zitron, *The New York City Teachers Union 1916-1964* (New York: Humanities Press, 1968), pp. 86-87.

[33] See Meyer Weinberg, *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 72-73.

[34] Lester B. Granger, "Race Relations and the School System (A Study of Negro High School Attendance in New Jersey)", *Opportunity*, (November 1925), p. 327.

[35] New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored Population, *Report ... to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey ... 1939* (Trenton, N.J.: The Legislature, 1939), p. 40.

[36] See, for example, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, "Negro Boycotts of Jim Crow Schools in the North, 1897-1925," *Integrated Education. 5(August-September, 1967, pp. 57-68. Cities studied in this article are Aiton, Ill., East Orange, N.J., and Springfield and Dayton, Ohio.*

[37] Rose Helper, *The Racial Practices of Real Estate Institutions in Selected Areas of Chicago* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 520.

[38] See Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber, *Negroes in Cities* (Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), p. 54.

[39] See Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*, pp. 374-382; Bond, "The Present Status of Racial Integration in the United States, With Especial Reference to Education," *Journal of Negro Education*, (Summer 1952), p. 244; L. D. Reddick, "The Education of Negroes in States Where Separate Schools Are Not Legal," *Journal of Negro Education*, (Summer 1947), p. 299; V. V. and Eleanor O. Oak, "The Illegal Status of Separate Education in New Jersey," *School and Society*, (May 21, 1938); New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored People, *Report* . . . pp. 38-45; and Robin M. Williams, Jr. and Margaret W. Ryan (eds.), *Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p.50

[40] Welch, "Education and Racial Discrimination," p. 22.

[41] Welch, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," *American Economic Review*, 63 (December 1973), p. 900.

[42] Ernest W. Swanson and John A. Griffin (eds.), *Public Education in the South, Today and Tomorrow. A Statistical Survey* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1955), p. 66.

[43] *Jackson Daily News* March 10, 1954, quoted in James M. Palmer, *Mississippi School Districts. Factors in the Disestablishment of Dual Systems* (State College Mississippi: Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, August 1971), p. 25.

[44] Arkansas Advisory Committee to the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Public Education in Arkansas, 1963, Still Separate and Still Unequal* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1963), p. 13.

[45] Tom Flake, "Expenditures. Dollars On a Treadmill," p. 36 in Patrick McCauley and Edward D. Ball (eds.), *Southern Schools: Progress and Problems* (Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1959).

[46] Weldon James, "Buildings and Equipment. Too Many Pupils, Too Few Dollars," p. 54 in *ibid.*

[47] Dr. Remus G. Robinson in U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearings Held in Detroit, Michigan* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 181-184. See, also, U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Education 1961 . . . Report* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 103-104.

[48] On New York, see Annie Stein, "Strategies for Failure," *Harvard Educational Review*, 41(May 1971) pp 158-204. On Chicago, see U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1963 Staff Report, *Public Education* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 85; Lawrence Landry, "The Chicago School Boycott," *New University Thought*, (December 1963-January 1964); and Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education*, 2(August-September 1964). On Boston, see Noel Day, "The Freedom Movement in Boston," *Integrated Education*, 2(December 1964-January 1965).

[49] See Alexander Crummell, *The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect*, The American Negro Academy, Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The Academy, 1898), p. 12; *Liberator*, February 26, 1856; *Liberator*, October 3, 1845; *Liberator*, May 17, 1839, and Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, p. 265

[50] See Victor Ullman, *Martin R. Delany. The Beginnings of Black Nationalism* (Boston, Mass.: Beacon, 1971), p. 18.

[51] W.E. Bigglestone, "Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," *Journal of Negro History*, 56(July 1971), p. 198.

[52] See Seymour E. Harris, *A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 931; and Charles H. Thompson, "75 Years of Negro Education," *Crisis*, 45 (July 1938), p. 204

[53] See W.E.B. DuBois (ed.), *The College-Bred Negro* (Atlanta, Ga.: Atlanta University Press, 1900), p. 42

[54] See data in James A. Colston, *State Financial Support of Higher Education in Georgia from 1932 to 1949 with Specific Reference to Higher Education for the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958), p. 46

[55] John Sekora, "Murder Relentless and Impassive: The American Academic Community and the Negro College," *Soundings*, 51(Fall 1968) p. 259

[56] Quoted in DuBois, *The College-Bred Negro*, p. 106

[57] W.E.B. Du Bois and Augustus G. Dill (eds.), *The College-Bred Negro American* (Atlanta, Ga.: Atlanta University Press, 1910), p. 25.

[58] *Crisis*, (July 1913), pp. 129 and 132.

[59] Arthur J. Klein (ed.), *Survey of Negro Colleges and Universities* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929), p. 246.

60Malcolm O'Leary, *Accreditation of Negro Colleges and Secondary Schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools* (Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1965), p. 22.

[61] Langston Hughes, "Cowards from the College," *Crisis*, 41 (August 1934). p. 227.

[62] *Crisis*, August 1930, pp. 262-263.

[63] See *Crisis*, January 1932, p. 466 and Charles S. Johnson, *The Negro College Graduate* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1938), p. 121.

[64] See *Crisis*, August 1930, p. 263 and Elizabeth Yates, *Howard Thurman. Portrait of a Practical Dreamer* (New York: John Day, 1964), p. 63.

[65] Richard J. Roche, *Catholic Colleges and the Negro Student* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948), p. 79.

[66] *Crisis*, August 1931, p. 262.

[67] See Leslie Pinckney Hill, "The State Teachers' College at Cheyney and Its Relation to Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education*, (October 1932), p. 413; Anna Arnold Hedgman, *The Trumpet Sounds. A Memoir of Negro Leadership* (New York: Holt, 1964), pp. 16-17; and Bigglestone, "Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," p. 217. Black students from Oberlin were excluded from the high school but not from the elementary schools.

[68] See *Crisis*, August 1930, p. 262 and August 1931, p. 262; Herbert Crawford Jenkins, *The Negro Student at*

the University of Iowa. A Sociological Study (Master's thesis, State University of Iowa, 1933), pp. 18 and 29; and Ina Corinne Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-1943), pp. 88-89.

[69] Brown and others, *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes*, II, pp. 88-89.

[70] See, for example, George Fishman, "Paul Robeson's Student Days and the Fight Against Racism at Rutgers," *Freedomways*, 9(Summer 1969), p. 228 and Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 32.

[71] *Crisis*, December 1913, p. 63 and January 1914, p. 117.

[72] W. E. B. DuBois, "Negroes in College," *Nation*, 112(March 3, 1926), p. 229.

[73] *Crisis*, January 1927, p. 133.

[74] Jenkins, *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa*, p. 29.

[75] See Michael R. Winston, "Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 695 and A. Gilbert Belles, "Negroes Are Few on College Faculties," *Southern Education Report*, 4(July-August 1968), p. 23.

[76] Winston, "Through the Back Door," p. 695.

[77] See *New York Age*, August 10, 1935.

[78] Thompson, "75 Years of Negro Education," pp. 204-205.

[79] National Advisory Committee on Education, *Federal Relations to Education*, Part I, *Committee Findings and Recommendations* (Washington, D.C.: National Capitol Press, 1931), p. 113.

[80] Jim Hightower, *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times. The Failure of the Land Grant College Complex* (Washington, D.C.: Agribusiness Accountability Project, 1972), p. 18.

[81] See Horace Mann Bond, "The Evolution and Present Status of Negro Higher and Professional Education in United States," *Journal of Negro Education*, 17 (Summer 1948), p. 225.

[82] Frank A. De Costa, "The Tax-Supported College for Negroes," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 22(February 1958), p. 266.

[83] Andrew Brimmer, "The Economic Outlook and the Future of the Negro College," *Daedalus*, 100(Summer 1971), p. 559.

[84] See Frank Bowles and Frank A. De Costa, *Between Two Worlds. A Profile of Negro Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 9171), pp. 142-144; Alan L. Sorkin, "A Comparison of Quality Characteristics of Negro and White Private and Church-Related Colleges and Universities in the South," *College and University*, 46(Spring 1971) pp. 199-210; and John A. Centra, Robert L. Linn, and Mary Ellen Parry, "Academic Growth in Predominantly Negro and Predominantly White Colleges," *American Educational Research Journal*, 7(January 1970), p. 97.

[85] Daniel C. Thompson, *Private Black Colleges At the Crossroads* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1973), p. 251.

[86] See, for example, William Payne, "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," *Civil Rights Digest*, 3(Spring 1970), pp. 14 and 17.

[87] U. S. President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy*, vol. II: *Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1948), pp. 6 and 26.

[88] "Breaking Down the Barriers of Discrimination in Higher Education," *School and Society*, 67(February 14, 1948), pp. 117-118. See, also, Raymond Walters, "The Cincinnati Meeting of the Association of American Colleges," *School and Society*, 67(January 31, 1948), p. 83

[89] See Robert H. Berls, "Higher Education Opportunity and Achievement in the United States," p. 181 in U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Joint Economic Committee, *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States. A Compendium of Papers ...* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), and John Egerton, "Inflated Body Count," *Change*, (July-August 1970), pp. 13-15.

[90] Andrew L. Goodrich, Lawrence W. Laziotte, and James A. Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey," *Community and Junior College Journal*, 43(December 1972-January 1973), p. 29.

[91] John K. Folger, Helene S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer, *Human Resources and Higher Education* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970), pp. 175 and 177.

[92] Goodrich, Laziotte, and Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges." A Survey," pp. 29 and 31.

[93] See August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, *CORE. A Study in the Civil Rights Movement 1942-1968* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), p. 185; Emily Alman, "Desegregation at Rutgers University," p. 212 in Rhoda L. Goldstein (ed.), *Black Life and Culture in the United States* (New York: Crowell, 1971); and James P. Comer, *Beyond Black and White* (New York: Quadrangle, 1972), p. 32.

[94] See, for example, Beth Janet Shapiro, *The Black Athlete at Michigan State University* (Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 11 and Robert L. Green, Joseph R. McMillan, and Thomas S. Gunnings, "Blacks in the Big Ten," *Integrated Education*, 10(May-June 1972), p. 39.

[95] See Calvin Trillin, *An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes* (New York: Viking, 1964), p. 83 and Aaron M. Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965), p. 146.

[96] Personal communication in possession of the author.

[97] Basic data in U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education. Fall 1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 116, 177, 185, 190, and 200.

CHAPTER 2
THE LEGAL FRAMEWORK

American court decisions were basic to the creation of racially discriminatory public school systems. During the era of slavery as well as in later years, courts adopted an activist stance in a largely successful effort to square school practices with those of a society in which racist doctrines were an article of widespread faith. Judicial lectures from the bench on the divine origin of the racial order were not uncommon. Through the 19th and part of the 20th centuries, the courts appeared to minorities as a recourse without redress.

Favorable court decisions were rare. Even when issued they were violated with impunity; or worse, ignored. State governments themselves frequently violated the decisions or laws based on them. Courts at all levels–State and Federal–followed a common code of conduct with respect to minorities. The U.S. Supreme Court usually supplied the icing on the cake of sorrows baked below.[1] Nor did geography provide a meaningful basis for fundamental distinctions once slavery had been abolished. The temper of northern and southern courts grew more similar.

About mid-20th century, minorities accelerated their political progress and succeeded in making a national issue of their unequal treatment. The courts–along with legislatures–began to manifest changes in their historic orientation. Those changes continue. They take on greater intelligibility when viewed within an historical context.

BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

The first compulsory ignorance law was enacted by South Carolina in 1740. Many southern States followed suit. During times of slave revolts or similar insecurities, nervous white legislatures stiffened the laws, making the fines and terms of imprisonment more stringent.[2] That few violators actually were brought into court attested to the almost unanimous obedience to the laws rather than loose enforcement of them. Late in the 18th and early in the 19th centuries, States enforced apprenticeship laws which required masters to teach even black apprentices to read and write. After a time, those laws were changed to relieve masters of such responsibility if their charges were black.[3]

In the North, State governments did not usually acknowledge a responsibility to educate black children. After Rhode Island liberated slaves in 1784, it failed to honor a provision in the Emancipation Bill making it compulsory to teach freed Negro children to read and write.[4] Some States such as Ohio explicitly closed the public schools to black children in 1829. For the next two decades, Negroes tried to change the common school law. In the late 'Forties and early 'Fifties, separate public schools for blacks were permitted. In Pennsylvania, even separate black public schools were not permitted by law until 1854.

Negro parents were required to pay school taxes whether or not their children could attend the schools. Sometimes the State law stipulated that in such cases, the school tax must be refunded to Negro parents. In Ohio and Illinois, however, authorities kept the money in direct violation of the law.[5] Systematic discrimination against black children was the rule in tangible aspects of schooling.[6]

Courts generally chose to enforce the color line. In *Chalmers v. Stewart*, the Ohio supreme court found in 1842 that a teacher who permitted black children to sit in a classroom when white parents objected thereby forswore claim to his salary. In that case, Judge Wood ruled that black children were in the class of "vicious and corrupt" persons.[7] The *Chalmers* doctrine was cited 8 years later by the Indiana supreme court in *Lewis v. Henley*. There, the court directed that tuition-paying black students must be excluded from a public school to make room for white children whose parents refused to send them to school with blacks. Judge Perkins explained the State legislature's reasoning in excluding Negro children from public schools as the conviction that "black children were... unfit associates of whites, as school companions."[8] Courts wavered on the importance of skin hue. In 1842, the Ohio supreme court ruled that light-skinned blacks possessed rights equal to those of whites on the ground that, in color, they were nearer white than black.[9] In 1859, the court reversed the ruling and held that blood, not color, was the significant characteristic. It spoke of the "visible taint of African blood."[10]

Iowa was an exception to the general course of events. In its first school law adopted in 1846, the year of statehood, black children were explicitly excluded. Eleven years later, following a campaign for equal school rights led by abolitionist Republicans, the State's constitution was amended to open the schools to all.[11]

One State court found school segregation to be constitutional. In 1850 the highest court in Massachusetts held that Boston school authorities had not acted unreasonably or illegally in requiring a Negro child to attend the all-black school even though she lived nearer a white school.[12] The school committee's rules declared that white children were "especially entitled to enter the schools nearest to their places of residence." Black children, however, were explicitly denied access to their neighborhood school. It was thus race, not place, that regulated school attendance in Boston. After a statewide campaign organized by the father of the excluded girl, the State legislature in 1855 outlawed school segregation.

CIVIL WAR TO 1950

IN THE SOUTH

All public school systems in the South created before the Civil War excluded black children by statute. Just after the war, the same rule continued. In 1866, Texas and Florida created school funds but excluded blacks from their benefits. The next year Kentucky did the same. Both in Florida and Kentucky, blacks were required to pay school taxes, but their children were prevented from attending the schools. They were given the option of building their own schools, in the case of Kentucky with proceeds from an additional school tax. None was built.[13]

The advent of radical reconstruction in 1867 resulted in giving blacks the vote and adoption of the 14th Amendment. Having attained formal citizenship, Negroes pried open the schools for their children. Discrimination in expenditures was forbidden. During the 1870's and early 1880's, as mentioned in the preceding chapter, more or less equality existed between black and white schools.

Numerous efforts were made to evade the new constitutional requirements. A favored way was to establish racially dual school systems, to be financed by separate taxes paid by each racial group. Black parents in Owensboro, Ky., attacked the practice in a Federal lawsuit decided in 1883. Since white parents were far wealthier than blacks, they established a school open for 9 to 10 months, while all the black parents could afford was one open for 3 months. Plaintiffs argued the disparity violated the equal protection requirement of the amendment. The Federal district court agreed. In *Claybrook v. Owensboro*, it held that "the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by this amendment must and can only mean the laws of the State must be equal in their benefit as well as in their burdens, and that less would not be 'the equal protection of the laws'".[14] The North Carolina supreme court ruled 3 years later in *Puitt v. Commissioners* that a similar tax scheme was unconstitutional.[15]

Both *Claybrook* and *Puitt* were turned against themselves by southern States. Formal compliance was achieved when State legislatures appropriated equal amounts per child of school age. By the late 1880's, however, it had become a practice for county school boards to allocate the State aid in a racially discriminatory way among schools under their jurisdiction. By the close of the 19th century, as a result, black schools had become severely underfinanced. Protests by black parents were without avail. By that time, the Negro voter had been effectively disfranchised.

An appeal to the Supreme Court against the system of discriminatory expenditures was made by black parents in Augusta, Ga. The school board had closed a black high school while keeping a white school open. No other public high school was available to black students. The Supreme Court in *Cumming v. County Board of Education,* unanimously turned down the black parents' request, explaining:

> ..While all admit that the benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective states, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land. We have here no such case to be determined. . .[16]

Cumming assured that the *Claybrook* and *Puitt* doctrine would remain a constitutional vacuity, bereft of any concrete consequence to their purported beneficiaries. The 14th Amendment became the framework of planned educational deprivation, administered in the name of States' rights.

Segregation had gained constitutional protection 3 years earlier when, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. It approved the provision of separate-but-equal accommodations in interstate transportation as not inconsistent with the 14th Amendment. Over the preceding 30 years, a number of northern and southern State courts had applied the same doctrine in public schools. The combination of *Cumming* and *Plessy* gave immense legal force to the coexistence of segregation and planned deprivation as one fed upon the other.

Wherever large numbers of black children were concentrated in single school districts, the greatest discrimination occurred. In Mississippi during 1920-1921, for example, nearly 80 percent of the population in 19 counties was black. Black children received less than one-eighth of the school expenditure spent on white children in three counties.[17] When, in 1925, Negro parents in Covington County appealed to the Mississippi supreme court for relief, the court refused, holding:

> It is of course not necessary that every child in the county have the same advantages in the way of education that every child has . . . The operation and conduct of public schools are practical affairs. You cannot discriminate against people on account of their race or condition, but their rights may depend upon their situation, or they may be classified according to such situation and condition.[18]

Under the *Cumming* doctrine, no appeal from this ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court was possible.

The first whole legal assault on the system of segregation and planned deprivation began in the 1930's. Negro teachers entered southern courts to demand that their salaries be made equal to those of white teachers. Most courts agreed and States moved to create single salary schedules.[19] Judges tended to draw out the period of changeover while numerous school boards evaded the orders by creating "professional rating scales" to establish salaries for individual teachers. Black teachers suffered from this new discrimination but salary equalization also became more of a fact, as the following table indicates:[20]

The ratio of black to total salaries rose from 41.7 percent to 74.8 percent over the 14-year period. Such substantial court victories introduced major strains into the structure of southern schools, based as it was on allotting to white students funds that belonged to Negro students. As equal expenditures neared reality, white privilege receded.

Black parents also began to bring court challenges to the system. By the early 1950's, some 200 local cases had been filed.[21] These attacked material inequalities and requested equalization.

AVERAGE SALARY PER MEMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, 1939-1940 to 1953-1954

	1939 1940	1949 1950	1953 1954	Percent increase 1939/1940 to 1953/1954
Negro schools	$ 601	$2,143	$2,861	376
All schools	$1,441	$3,010	$3,825	165

While only occasional parent lawsuits were successful, the impact of these few on black public opinion was considerable. In the context of the teachers' lawsuits, and the rapidly-growing movement of Negro self-organization, exemplified by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the parents' actions were exceedingly important.

IN THE NORTH

During the years 1865-1950, numerous northern State courts considered cases involving the rights of Negro children to attend nonsegreated schools. While the number of court victories was considerable, few were translated into everyday school practice.

In Illinois at the end of the Civil War, black children were still excluded by law from the common schools. Under pressure by black citizens, the restriction was dropped in 1872, but no penalty was attached to continued exclusion until 1874 when the State supreme court outlawed the building of an all-black annex to an elementary school.[22] A dozen years later, however, a State appeals court permitted a school district to assign white students to otherwise unavailable white schools outside their regular area of assignment.[23] The 1874 stipulation against separate schools meant little in southern Illinois. In 1904, an historian wrote: "Colored schools exist in many places. Alton has forced its colored people into schools by themselves."[24] In Chicago during the 1920's and 1930's, teachers were employed on the basis of racial criteria. They were also assigned on the same basis.[25]

The 1947 Illinois directory of schools, issued by the State superintendent of public instruction, listed black and white schools by race, yet the existence of such schools was outlawed, presumably, in 1874. In 1947 the school board of Edwardsville, in the southern part of the State, maintained a 4-year white high school while the black high school operated only a 3-year program. When the Illinois Commission on Human Relations, a State agency, urged the State Superintendent to cut off State aid to districts which segregated schools illegally, the superintendent "replied that he had no authority to make such investigations unless the elected State's attorneys in those counties initiated suit against the elected school boards."[26] The likelihood of a States attorney in any part of Illinois taking such action was negligible at best.

School segregation in New Jersey was forbidden by State law in 1881 and by State supreme court ruling 3 years later.[27] State agencies violated both the law and ruling repeatedly over the next half-century.[28] As in Illinois, New Jersey school authorities published school statistics by race and maintained two all-black vocational schools taught only by Negroes. Black parent challenges to segregated conditions were virtually always turned down by the State. Even when school districts admitted the charge was correct, the State refused to order a change. During the 1930's, segregation spread further into the northern part of the State, again without encountering official opposition.[29] Deterioration of educational conditions was reported in the areas of growing segregation.

Throughout the North, assignment of children to specific schools was determined by a broad range of criteria. Contrary to countless recent assertions, place of residence was not one of these; at least, not for black children. Except rarely, American courts refused to recognize a claim to school assignment on the basis of residence. Almost uniformly, courts acknowledged the authority of school boards to assign students to schools. Usually, when black parents applied for an order directing a board to permit black children to attend the nearest school—often a white one—instead of a distant school—often a black one—the request was denied. As a result, Negro school children frequently went to schools which were far from their homes, hazardous to safety and health, heavily overcrowded, and inferior educationally. Blacks were not permitted the privilege of a neighborhood school.[30] This was even truer in the South.

SINCE 1950

IN THE SOUTH

In mid-1950, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund (LDF) began a frontal assault on the principle of segregation. Until then, the group had litigated for equal-although-separate schools. Five separate cases, initiated by black parents, were argued by the LDF before the Supreme Court during 1952-1955. These concerned schools in Sumerton, S.C.; Farmville, Va.; Topeka, Kans.; Wilmington, Del.; and Washington, D.C. LDF lawyer Robert L. Carter stated the plaintiffs' principal contention:

> . . . We have been deprived of the equal protection of the laws where the statute requires appellants to attend public elementary schools on a segregated basis, because the act of segregation in and of itself denies them equal educational opportunities which the Fourteenth Amendment secures.[31]

On May 17, 1954, the Court unanimously accepted the argument and ruled:

> . . . In the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. . . We hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated . . . are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. *Brown v. Board of Education* (I), 347 U.S. 483, at 495.

The Court delayed implementation for a year, meanwhile soliciting views on the form a final order should take.

Benjamin Muse, the historian, reported that news of the *Brown* decision was received without elation in the black communities: "There was no dancing in the streets. The significance was not quickly grasped by the Negro masses. . . "[32] Very probably the reverse was nearer the mark. Two questions about *Brown* remained unanswered in 1954-55: (1) *What* action was required? and (2) *When* would the action be performed? If the Negro masses were skeptical about both questions, their sentiments were more than matched by the LDF attorneys.

In April 1955, the Supreme Court conducted a 5-day hearing on implementation. Repeatedly, LDF chief counsel Thurgood Marshall pressed the Court to set a definite timetable for desegregation. If the pace of desegregation were left to the States, Marshall declared: ". . . Then the Negro . . . would be in a horrible shape. He . . . would be as bad, if not worse off then under the 'separate but equal' doctrine . . . "[33] District court judges would be too solicitous of local school boards. "It is a national Constitution," said Marshall, "there is no place for local option in our Constitution."[34] On the last day of the hearing, he returned to the matter of a deadline, but placing it within a context of racism:

> This time limit becomes a part of the effectiveness . . . of the May 17 decision. But I don't believe any argument has ever been made to this Court to postpone the enforcement of a constitutional right. The argument is never made until Negroes are involved.[35]

Representatives of the southern States warned of widespread resistance should immediate desegregation be ordered.

In May 1955, the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education* (II). No deadline was set. Instead, the Federal district courts were to take jurisdiction over school segregation cases. Negro children were to be admitted to public schools "as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis." School boards were directed to proceed "with all deliberate speed." *Brown II*, in the retrospective opinion of a former LDF lawyer, Robert L. Carter, was "a grave mistake" since its deliberate-speed formula set up the standard of compliance only "on terms that the white South could accept." Thus, Carter concluded, "the Warren Court sacrificed individual and immediate vindication of the newly discovered right to desegregated education . . . "[36]

Another weakness, shared by *Brown I* and *Brown II*, was the exclusive emphasis upon dismantling segregation. Historically, segregation had served as the means of planned deprivation. But this aspect of the situation was ignored in the *Brown* proceedings. School boards were not required to do anything differently than they had ever done before. Reducing or eliminating the gross material disparities between black and white schools did not form part of the order. For their own part, LDF lawyers very likely feared raising the question inasmuch as the Court might have chosen to resurrect *Plessy*, only on an equal-but-separate rather than a separate-but-equal basis. During arguments on *Brown I* southern State attorneys insisted that material equality was on the verge of being attained and thus segregation no longer exacted a special price from Negro children. LDF lawyer Spottswood Robinson replied that "even though Virginia could spend $26 millions—an enormous sum by Virginia standards—all that we succeed in doing is moving from a present 61 cents to 79 cents per Negro student for each dollar that is invested in buildings and sites for white students."[37]

Whatever the structural weaknesses of *Brown*, Negro parents seized on the decision as a chance for an equal education. Within weeks after *Brown II* was handed down, many of these parents filed petitions with school boards, demanding entry for their children—among other places, in Orangeburg, S.C. and Yazoo City, Miss. In Virginia black parents petitioned in Newport News, Norfolk, Alexandria, Charlottesville, Arlington County, and Isle of Wight County. In each case, the petitions were rejected. Petitioners in Orangeburg and Yazoo City suffered retaliation from the white community by losing their jobs and credit; sharecroppers were evicted; and grocers refused to sell food to some.[38]

Repulsed by school boards, parents turned to the Federal district courts. Here, they lost more frequently than not.[39] In several instances, State authorities flouted Federal district court rulings favorable to desegregation; no penalty followed. From 1954 to 1960, in only 5 of 10 cases involving violence to stop a court order did Federal authorities intervene.[40] Bills were introduced in Congress during 1957 and 1960 authorizing the U.S. Department of Justice to represent black parents in desegregation cases. Both times the provision was dropped.

In the 10th school year after *Brown I*, only 34, 100—i.e., 1.2 percent—of the nonborder South's 2,894,563 black children attended desegregated schools. This slender consequence of *Brown* resulted from numerous effective techniques of noncompliance adopted by southern States. Legislatures passed laws that stopped State aid from being paid to desegregated schools, closed schools under court order to desegregate, repealed compulsory attendance laws to permit white children to leave desegregrated schools, appropriated State funds to private segregated schools, and aimed at driving the NAACP from various States. In 1962, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights called pupil placement laws "the principal obstacle to desegregation in the South."[41] These measures required individual black children who wished to attend a white school to fill out special application forms, take tests (if necessary), resort to formal appeals, and the like. Meanwhile, students were to be assigned to their traditional school. In effect, these placement laws were a new form of State assignment of schools by race, the very practice outlawed by *Brown*. State and Federal courts regularly rejected black parents' challenges to placement laws. Between 1955 and 1963, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review all cases involving such challenges.[42]

The Nation was wrenched from its constitutional slumber by the mass movement of protesting blacks, in South and North, during the early 1960's. As indicated in the previous chapter, the movement led by black students in the South set off a new explosion of peaceful energy which found its counterpart in the North. Passage of the Civil Rights Act in 1964 was a direct result of the movement. The new law created the basis for significant progress in the South. Two sections of the law were especially important for education. Title IV authorized the U.S. Commissioner of Education to help school districts to desegregate, and empowered the Attorney General to institute lawsuits to bring about desegregation. Title VI forbade the use of Federal funds in any federally assisted program that practiced racial discrimination. In so stipulating, Congress pledged the power of the purse to the goal of equal educational opportunity.

"This legislation," wrote Martin Luther King in 1965, "was first written in the streets."[43] Enforcement of the Civil Rights Act also began there. During the years 1965-1969, black people in the United States conducted an immense number of demonstrative actions on behalf of desegregation. (See Chapter 10 for a more detailed discussion.) Within the context of mass actions, the Federal Government felt pressed to effectuate the goals of the new law. Between 1963 and 1968, desegregation advanced further than during all the years since *Brown*.[44]

Day-to-day enforcement of title VI by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) proceeded according to a set of desegregation guidelines formulated early in 1965. While the guidelines document was vague in many respects, it was far more detailed than the text of *Brown II*. Southern Congressmen sought to weaken the guidelines or their application by budget and political threats. The administration, by 1967-1968, permitted severe weakening of HEW enforcement efforts. Between 1965 and 1969, the number of HEW personnel working directly on desegregation fell from 75 to 34. The Department of Justice filed fewer enforcement actions each year. In January, 1969, on the occasion of a change in national administration, the head of HEW's civil rights office wrote in an

PERCENTAGE OF NEGRO STUDENTS ATTENDING DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN SEVEN SOUTHERN STATES IN THE 1963-64 AND 1968-69 SCHOOL YEARS

	1963-1964	1968-1969
Alabama	.007	7.4
Georgia	.052	14.2
Louisiana	.602	8.8
Mississippi	.000	7.1
North Carolina	.537	27.8
South Carolina	.003	14.9
Virginia	1.630	25.7

internal memorandum that except for Justice Department lawsuits "there has been virtually no enforcement of civil rights provisions by any other [agency] of Government."[45] A general lassitude of civil rights enforcement existed at the conclusion of the Johnson administration. This tendency was accelerated under the Nixon administration.

The Civil Rights Act was important as a transition from the lagging enforcement of *Brown*. As previously stated, desegregation developed significantly after 1964. Yet, the progress was limited. Desegregation in the South made large strides only when the Supreme Court adopted a new stance towards *Brown*.

The promise of *Brown II* was evaded, as already indicated, by the pupil placement laws. These effective impediments to desegregation were succeeded in the late 1950's and mid-1960's by "free-choice" desegregation plans. Under these, students were declared "free" to select a school of their choice. Intimidation of black children, was common. U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II told Congress:

> When our fieldworkers investigate free-choice plans which are not producing school desegregation they find that in almost all instances the freedom of choice is illusory. Typically, the community atmosphere is such that Negro parents are fearful of choosing a white school for their children.[46]

Nevertheless, Federal courts regularly approved free-choice plans. They had been doing so since 1955. In that year, several weeks after *Brown II*, a three-judge Federal court in South Carolina ruled in *Briggs v. Elliott* that "the Constitution . . . does not require integration. It merely forbids segregation."[47] Thus, *Brown* II was interpreted by *Briggs* to require only that individual black students had a right to apply for transfer into white schools. *Briggs* denied any positive obligation by school districts to desegregate entire school systems. While the Supreme Court never adopted *Briggs*, a large number of lower Federal courts did so for more than a decade.

The death knell of *Briggs* was sounded by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, sitting in New Orleans. In 1966 and 1967 it ruled in *United States v. Jefferson County*. Since the Supreme Court rejected a subsequent appeal the latter year, the Fifth Circuit opinion became authoritative. "What is wrong about *Briggs*," held the aforementioned appeals court, "is that it drains out of *Brown* that decision's significance as a class action to secure equal educational opportunities for Negroes by compelling the States to reorganize their public school systems."[48] Thus, ruled the court, schools in the circuit "have the affirmative duty under the Fourteenth Amendment to bring about an integrated, unitary school system in which there are no Negro schools and no white schools–just schools."[49] While carefully drawn free-choice plans could still be used, the court set up a standard of performance by which such plans were to be evaluated: "Has the operation of the promised plan actually eliminated segregated and token-desegregated schools and achieved substantial integration?"[50]

In 1968, the Supreme Court went a step further than the Fifth Circuit in the *Green v. New Kent County* case.[51] It now ruled that "the burden on a school board today is to come forward with a [desegregation] plan that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work *now*." Racial discrimination in the schools must be eliminated "root and branch." The high court called for "a system without a 'white' school and a 'Negro' school, but just schools." Inclusion of the word "now" in the decision was the nearest the Supreme Court had yet come to granting the NAACP LDF request of 1955 for a timetable of desegregation.

The following year, the Court ruled in *Alexander v. Holmes*, a Mississippi case.[52] It held that the "obligation of every school district is to terminate dual school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools." The decision was handed down on October 29, 1969; by the following January, the public schools of the State were desegregated.

Green and *Alexander* took the matter of desegregation out of the realm of formalistic compliance unaccompanied by substantial consequences. Both decisions signalled a new sense of urgency and realism by the high court. Together, they constituted a sweeping amendment of *Brown II*.

In 1971, the Supreme Court ruled in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, a landmark case that, in one respect, rivaled *Brown I* in importance: The Court now considered the implications of residential segregation for school desegregation. *Brown II* had advised district courts to seek compact attendance areas around schools to embrace all who lived nearby, black and white alike. Given the existence of segregated residence, however, compactness of school attendance areas inevitably meant those areas would be segregated. Segregated housing, the *Swann* court acknowledged, could help create segregated schools. But the reverse was also true:

> People gravitate toward school facilities, just as schools are located in response to the needs of people. The location of schools may thus influence the patterns of residential development of a metropolitan area and have important impact on composition of inner city neighborhoods.

Under such conditions effective desegregation might, the Court held, require the drawing of school attendance areas that "are neither compact nor contiguous; indeed they may be on opposite ends of the city." Since under this condition assignment to the school nearest the student's residence would not dismantle the dual system, "desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school." If mandatory student transportation were needed, school boards could employ it.

Residential segregation was thus placed under constitutional scrutiny. In urban areas—both in the North and South—*Brown I* suddenly took on an immediacy that had been lacking for the previous 17 years. Since the overwhelming majority of black children in the country lived in urban areas, under residentially segregated circumstances, the potential of *Swann* was enormous. Student transportation in such areas was the single most effective instrument in achieving desegregation. Opposition to desegregation frequently took the form of opposition to student transportation called "busing."

Student transportation at public expense had developed steadily in the half-century before *Swann*:[54]

School year	Percent of Students transported
1920-21	5.6
1931-32	9.2
1941-42	18.3
1951-52	29.0
1961-62	38.1
1969-70	42.8

In the South, transportation was organized on a racially discriminatory basis. During the mid-30's in 12 southern States, 27.3 percent of all white children enrolled were transported as compared with only 3.2 percent of the black children; Louisiana had the most disparate record (45.2 and 0.5 percent).[55] It was common to transport black children past nearby white schools. In Yancey County, N.C., during 1962, black high school students were refused entry to the nearest school and had to make an 80-mile round trip daily to a Negro school in Asheville; in mid-1964, black high school students in Havana, Ark., were bused daily for a round trip of 120 miles.[56] These practices were consistent with the general system of segregation and planned deprivation.

By 1971, the year of *Swann*, walking had become a minor means whereby students traveled to attend school in the country as a whole. That year, nearly 50 million went to school. Here is how they got there:[57]

	Number	Percent
School bus	19,030,000	38.2
Public transportation	1,514,000	3.0
Private automobile	8,140,000	16.3
Walk/bicycle	20,951,000	42.1
Other	248,000	0.4
Total	49,883,000	100.0

Curiously, not only citizen discussion but even scholarly articles assumed that student transportation was somehow abnormal. (This subject will be examined in more detail in chapter 6.) School buses had a superior safety record over either walking to school or riding in a private automobile. Compared with walking, buses were as much as six times safer; with riding in a private automobile, eight times safer.[58] Nevertheless, antibusing became a politically respectable movement in the years after *Swann.*

Green, *Alexander*, and *Swann* enabled desegregation in the South to become a practical reality rather than merely an abstract constitutional right. Between 1968 and the 1971-72 school year—the first one after *Swann*—the percentage of Negro children attending predominantly black schools in the 11-State South fell sharply from 68.0 to 9.2.[59] (The educational consequences of these changes are examined later in several chapters.)

IN THE NORTH

At midcentury, no distinctive body of law had developed around the specific relationship of race and education in the North. The long history of official and unofficial State action on behalf of racial discrimination in northern schools remained unwritten; perhaps even forgotten. However, the Supreme Court in *Brown I* referred to the abolition of segregation in the public schools of Boston, it also observing:

> **But elsewhere in the North segregation in public education has persisted in some communities until recent years. It is apparent that such segregation has long been a nationwide problem, not merely one of sectional concern.[60]**

The following year, in *Brown II*, the Court decreed: "All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting such [racial] discrimination [in public education] must yield . . . " By 1955, in no northern State was there a statutory basis to school segregation. The last such law—in Indiana—had been repealed 5 years earlier.

Black parents in the North had been suing school boards for more than a century. Almost always they complained of overt discrimination against their children. These acts ranged from outright exclusion, to segregation in separate quarters or within the common school building, to inequitable financial requirements. Courts were generally inhospitable to appeals for redress, but occasional parent victories occurred. No such case was ever considered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

During the decade after *Brown,* northern school boards and their attorneys formulated a legal doctrine which in effect was to relieve them of accountability for school segregation. This doctrine asserted a sharp distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation; the former was caused by affirmative statutory authority, the latter was a happenstance consequence of residential segregation. The one was conscious and designed while the other was neutral and impersonal. Clearly, the intent was to identify *de jure* segregation with the pre-*Brown* South and *de facto* segregation with the North.

Historically, the *de facto* doctrine was weak. Deliberate segregative action by northern public officials was widespread. Even in northern States with a history of segregation laws—such as Indiana and Missouri—legislation brought no changes in the pattern of assignment of students. On the other hand, the comparative rarity of segregation laws in the North lent plausibility to the argument. In the absence of declared public commitment to segregation by school boards, potential plaintiffs were faced by an immense job of gathering facts if and when they would opt to file suit. Another possible avenue was to attack the racial concentration itself, without regard to how it arose.

Under *Plessy*, separation was constitutionally valid unless it were accompanied by unequal facilities. That the availability of equal facilities under segregation was a myth both in the North and South did not prevent courts from ignoring the obvious. Separation as such was unobjectionable under the *Plessy* doctrine.

Before 1954, apparently only three cases concerning segregation as such came before State courts, two in New York and one in Indiana. In 1900, black plaintiffs in Queens, New York City charged discrimination in that their children were assigned to a single school. The court rejected the claim, holding "it is equal school facilities and accommodations that are required to be furnished and not equal social opportunities."[61] In 1943, the New York State Commissioner of Education closed an illegal all-black school in Ramapo because it was patently inferior to the white school. He stressed, however, that "if the [attendance] lines are reasonably drawn the fact that most or all the school children are of one race or another race does not render the zoning illegal."[62] In 1926, when Indianapolis authorities announced they were going to build a high school, black parents sued to force the choice of another site. They contended that since the announced site was in the midst of a Negro area of residence, the new school would almost certainly be all-black. The court rejected this argument and ruled: "In the absence of fraud, the court will not interpose and impose upon school authorities the judgment of the court concerning matters committed by law to the discretion of school authorities."[63]

All three cases involved intentional policies of separation by school authorities. In New York in 1900 and Indiana in 1926, deliberate segregation was allowed by law. By 1943, New York law no longer permitted segregation. Yet, the board of education had continued to practice it. None of the three cases exemplifies *de facto* segregation since in none of them was segregation fortuitous or unplanned.

The advent of *Brown* left the legal situation in the North unaffected, at best. In 1956, the New York State Commissioner of Education ruled that citizens of Babylon were unjustified in challenging the existence of a predominantly minority school. He held: "Because of the incidence of location, the mere fact that the preponderance of the children who would normally attend the neighborhood school happened to be white or Negro, of Polish, Irish, Scotch, Swedish, Italian or English descent or otherwise . . . does not require a board to attempt to gerrymander the [attendance] lines, to assign but a certain percentage to a particular school."[64] Both in Kansas and South Carolina, Federal courts explicitly approved the existence of one-race schools. In the former case the court held:

> Desegregation does not mean that there must be intermingling of the races in all school districts . . . If . . . the [school attendance] district is inhabited entirely by colored students, no violation of any constitutional right results because they are compelled to attend the school in the district in which they live.

(Ironically, this ruling was the last one made by a Federal court in the original *Brown* case.) *Briggs* drew the same conclusion.

Racial concentration in the absence of legal mandate was thus as constitutional under *Brown* as under *Plessy*. Black experience in the United States, however, embraced more than segregation in the schools. It also included, inevitably, inferior facilities and lesser educational opportunities. During the arguments on *Brown* before the Supreme Court in 1953-1954, segregation—not deprivation—was made the issue. Having ruled against the first, the Court ignored the second. But, clearly, the condition continued to exist. Was deprivation of black children therefore constitutional? Or, was it unconstitutional only if deliberate? If so, did black parents have any recourse where evidence of intent was unavailable?

One reply emerged in 1957 when the Virginia supreme court in *Dobbins v. Commonwealth* ordered an all-white high school in West Point to accept a black applicant rather than force her to attend an inferior black high school. Her father had refused to send her to the latter school and kept her home. The State board of education charged him with violation of the compulsory attendance law. This action was struck down by the State high court which ruled that "application of a criminal statute so that it brings about or results in inequality of treatment to the two races is not justified."[66]

The potential significance of *Dobbins* became clearer the next year when a magistrate in a New York City family court ruled boldly that black parents who withheld their children from attendance in all-black schools on the ground that these were inferior were not neglecting their children's education.[67] Justice Justine Wise Polier characterized the all-black schools as inferior because they were segregated and staffed with teachers who were not as qualified as those in predominantly white schools elsewhere in the city. With both parties doubtful of the future course of an appeal, an out-of-court settlement was reached; it applied only to the case at hand. The larger issue was laid aside.[68]

Litigation in the North during the 1960's was controlled largely by the *Briggs* doctrine as mediated through *Bell v. School Board* (involving Gary, Ind.) and *Downs v. Board of Education* (involving Kansas City, Mo.). In both, concentrations of black students were approved since they had resulted presumably from assignment to schools by residence, not race.[69] Unless plaintiffs could prove that school boards had engaged in overt discrimination, the existing segregation was explained as a simple reflection of residential segregation—thus not the boards' doing. This was the concept of *de facto* segregation.

Critics of the doctrine rejected the concept of a neutral school board, and pointed out that board action was State action, thus implicating school authorities in violations of equal protection.[70] More salient for change than scholarship in this area, however, was political pressure arising from the civil rights movement. In New York State, the Board of Regents in 1960 adopted a policy of desegregation. Courts upheld efforts of school boards to comply voluntarily. They ruled that such plans, based as they must be in part on racial considerations, were not attempts to discriminate. In New Jersey, the State supreme court went further in *Booker v. Board of Education*—involving Plainfield—and held that the State was obliged to correct "substantial racial imbalance which may be educationally harmful though it has not reached the standard of 'all or nearly all Negro'."[71] Massachusetts in 1965 passed the Racial Imbalance Act which required school boards to desegregate once a school had a predominantly black enrollment. In 1963, Illinois had passed the Armstrong Act, aimed at eliminating segregation by revising attendance area boundaries.

The *de facto* doctrine was severely weakened by these changes for they contradicted the formula: "we do not need to correct what we did not cause." Since *Brown*, deliberate segregation has been illegal. Now, so-called nondeliberate segregation began to lose its legal protection in several States.

Oddly enough, the most serious blow to the *de facto* doctrine came from court decisions which found school districts guilty of *de jure* segregation. Between 1961 and 1972, as the table on page 12 indicates, Federal district courts outside the South found nine school boards violating the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment:

Since this compilation was drawn up, similar findings were made by Federal courts with respect to Indianapolis, Detroit, Kalamazoo, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Dayton, Minneapolis, Braddock, Pa., and Kinloch, Mo. In addition, during the same recent period, State courts ruled similarly in two Illinois cities (Waukegan and Madison) and three California cities (Los Angeles, Inglewood, and Richmond). Administrative action against northern school boards has occurred in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts and, on a Federal level, by limited proceedings of the Office for Civil Rights in HEW.

In 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Keyes v. School District*, its first "northern" case. It accepted evidence from a lower court that Denver school authorities had deliberately segregated part of the city's schools. Teachers had been assigned by race and students channeled to certain schools. ". . . A finding of intentionally segregative school board actions in a meaningful portion of a school system, as in this case," held the Supreme Court, "creates a presumption that other segregated schooling within the system is not adventitious."[72] The burden of proof, therefore, lay upon the school board to demonstrate that its action elsewhere in the school system were untainted by intention to segregate. Later in the year, the lower court, following Supreme Court instructions, held a new hearing and found that the entire school system of Denver was unconstitutionally segregated.[73]

By the mid-1970's, the principal judicial supports of *de facto* doctrine had been removed. In 1968, in *Green*, the Supreme Court rejected the *Briggs* rule that there was no affirmative obligation to desegregate. Five years later, the Court laid that obligation upon a northern school district, even in the absence of either a State segregation law or direct courtroom testimony attesting to district-wide discriminatory acts by the school board. State legislation requiring affirmative desegregation action spread during the late 60's and early 70's. A series of important State supreme court decisions in 1971-1972 added to the movement away from *de facto* doctrine.[74] Many of these legal steps still lacked full implementation.

Meanwhile, in judicial terms, northern desegregation in 1975 was roughly where southern desegregation had been 10 years before. Aside from school districts found violating the Fourteenth Amendment, there existed no general obligation by school districts to desegregate entire school

Types of Discrimination Found By Federal District Courts In Northern Desegregation Cases, 1961-1972*

Type of discrimination found by the court	Denver, Colo.	Las Vegas, Nev.	Manhassett, N.Y.	New Rochelle, N.Y.	Oxnard, Calif.	Pasadena, Calif.	Pontiac, Mich.	San Francisc Calif.
1. Discriminatory drawing or alterations of attendance zones	X		X	X		X	X	X
2. Discriminatory location of new schools	X	X			X	X	X	X
3. Discriminatory expansion of existing schools (e.g., enlarging minority schools rather than transferring minority students to nearby white schools with space available)	X	X			X	X		X
4. School board's failure to relieve overcrowding at white schools by transferring white students to nearby minority schools where space was available	X							
5. Discriminatory hiring of teachers and administrators	X					X	X	
6. Discriminatory assignment of teachers and administrators	X	X				X	X	X
7. Discriminatory promotion of teachers and administrators						X		
8. School board's perpetuation or exacerbation of segregation in schools by its strict adherence to neighborhood school policy after segregated school system had developed		X	X	X		X		
9. School board's failure to adopt a proposed integration plan, or to implement previously adopted plans	X				X			
10. School board's adoption of "open enrollment" or "free transfer" policies having the effect of allowing whites to transfer out of black schools without producing a significant movement of blacks to white schools or whites to black schools				X	X	X		

*Testimony of William L. Taylor in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Bus* . . . . , Part 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1972), p. 1682.

Types of Discrimination Found By Federal District Courts In Northern Desegregation Cases, 1961-1972*

the court	Denver, Colo.	Las Vegas, Nev.	Manhassett, N.Y.	New Rochelle, N.Y.	Oxnard, Calif.	Pasadena, Calif.	Pontiac, Mich.	San Francisco, Calif.	South Holland, Ill.
erations of	X		X	X		X	X	X	X
ew schools	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
f existing minority ransferring arby white e)	X	X			X	X		X	
to relieve chools by to nearby space was	X								X
chers and	X					X	X		X
f teachers	X	X				X	X	X	X
f teachers						X			
tion or ation in erence to licy after tem had		X	X	X		X			
adopt a n, or to pted plans	X				X				
of "open transfer" f allowing of black ucing a blacks to to black				X	X	X			

in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing, Hearings* Government Printing Office 1972), p. 1682.

systems. Instead, school boards were employing numerous renovated free-choice arrangements, called open enrollment, magnet schools, voluntary desegregation, and other names. These constitute an effort by boards to interpret *Brown* as simply expanding educational alternatives for single children rather than eliminating dual systems of educational opportunity.

In the North as a whole, by fall, 1970 slightly over one-fourth (27.7 percent) of all black pupils attended predominantly white schools. In the South, this proportion had risen sharply over the preceding 2 years from 18.4 to 38.1 percent.[75] Around the turn of the decade, the northern cities that desegregated did so under court order or administrative decree. Few desegregated voluntarily. (Nor, of course, had many southern districts done so.) The crucial difference between contemporary desegregation in the North and South lies in the role of the Supreme Court. Should it continue to extend its guidance to northern school districts, a considerable change will undoubtedly occur. In the absence of such action, pressure will build to adopt a national legislative policy of desegregation applicable equally to North and South. Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment could provide the legal framework for such a step.[76]

Unequal expenditures for black and white students have been an historic feature of dual schooling, both in the North and South. *Brown* did not deal with this problem. While the racial expenditure gap narrowed after *Brown,* it by no means disappeared. Researchers found it more difficult to ascertain the precise dimensions of the gap as publication of racial breakdown of expenditures virtually ceased. In addition, few if any school districts published an accounting of actual per school and per child expenditures; at best, only budgeted or authorized expenditure data were available. Further, much of the information was districtwide; per school data were simply averaged out.

The problem of a black-white gap has been submerged, if not assimilated, into another problem–i.e., unequal per student expenditures that vary between taxing units within single States. A single remedy, abolishing or modifying the property tax or altering its administration, has monopolized the attention of reformers. The master assumption seems to be that the black-white gap is a lesser inequity than the interdistrict disparities; and that the more school financing approaches a statewide basis, the more equitable the entire system will become.

This faith finds only modest historical support. The development of State responsibility for the common schools did, of course, greatly increase educational opportunities. For minority children, however, this was less true. In 1926, Bond, after a close study of black education in Oklahoma, observed that the Negro schools "are going to remain below par just as long as the county remains the unit of financial support."[77] On the other hand, historian Louis R. Harlan, after an analysis of black schooling in the Southeast from 1901 to 1915, concluded: "Simply enlarging the unit of taxation was not a solution of the inequities of southern school finance, even for whites."[78]

Virtually no researcher has tried to measure systematically school-by-school intradistrict inequalities that relate to race and class. In New York City and Chicago, recent (early 1970's) analyses indicated the existence of such inequality.[79] Repeated instances of similar character were widely reported by white teachers in the South assigned to newly desegregated, formerly all-black schools. Extensive audits of school district expenditures by the HEW audit agency concluded that significant sums of money appropriated for "educationally deprived" children had not been used for this purpose.

The case for property tax reform to equalize interdistrict inequalities has its own justification. But it is separate from the problem of intradistrict inequalities. Until, in the words of *Green,* all schools are "just schools", without stigmas of race and class, it is idle to imagine that they can be financed as though they *were* "just schools."

HIGHER EDUCATION

Southern States used Morrill Act funds as reported in the previous chapter exclusively to set up white land grant colleges. Although the size of the land-grant for colleges was dependent ultimately on the size of population, including blacks, the latter were excluded from the law's benefits. Friends of the freedmen complained to Congress of this discrimination. They were on the verge of victory in 1866 when a House of Representatives committee sponsored an amendment to the Morrill Act: "That ... no person shall be excluded on account of race or color from the benefits of the school or educational fund arising from the lands thus donated."[80] The provision was dropped after unfavorable discussion on the floor of the House.

In 1890, a second Morrill Act was passed. This one provided that no State could receive grants unless the proceeds were "equitably divided" among the races. Enforcement powers were lodged with the Secretary of the Interior. During the first decade of the law, the Secretary suspended funds to South Carolina in order to force the State to increase appropriations for its black land grant college. An appeal to Congress restored the cut. Apparently, the Secretary of the Interior never tried again.[81]

In effect, the failure of enforcement of the Morrill Act produced in higher education the same situation created in 1899 by *Cumming*. The States were left free from Federal regulation to do almost as they wished with black education. In Texas, the constitution of 1876 pledged to establish a State university for blacks "when practicable." Seventy years later the pledge was still unredeemed. In 1921, a Missouri law created the Board of Curators for Lincoln University and directed it "to afford the Negro people of the State opportunity for training up to the standard furnished at the State University of Missouri whenever necessary and practicable in their opinion."[82] No action was ever taken by the curators.

Excluded without exception from southern State universities. Negroes wishing to enroll as graduate students began turning to the courts in 1933. Two years later, Donald Murray, a graduate of Amherst College, sued successfully to gain entrance to the University of Maryland.[83] Amid celebrations in black communities, NAACP chief counsel Charles H. Houston predicted that "the other southern State universities are not going to confess error just because Murray obtained a favorable decision in Maryland."[84] Houston proved correct. Southern universities forced each black applicant to sue separately. Every action was based on the ground of equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment. In turn, the universities usually referred applicants to the Negro land grant college in the State.

In 1936, Lloyd Gaines, a Negro, applied to enter the law school of the University of Missouri. He was rejected and advised either to request the black college, Lincoln University, to initiate a law course or to apply for an out-of-State scholarship. Gaines sued, and lost; the State supreme court upheld the decision. Gaines appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court which, in 1938, decided in his favor.[85] "The basic consideration," held the Court, "is . . . what opportunities Missouri . . . furnishes to white students and denies to Negroes solely upon the ground of color." Rejected was the option of out-of-State tuition. The Court explained that equal opportunity must be offered within the State's own boundaries. To avoid desegregating the State university, Missouri legislators, the next year, increased appropriations to all-black Lincoln University, and, overnight, courses and professional schools parallel with those at the University of Missouri were to be offered.

Gaines was an effort to stress the equality of separate-but-equal. It rejected separation with differential quality offerings. Southern States, however, evaded the new emphasis on equal facilities. And they minimized the desegregative impact of the decision. Four devices were employed. The first was the out-of-State scholarship with dollar value almost always less than the average State expenditure per student at white State universities. Second, was the regional association of southern States which permitted blacks from one State to attend an institution in an associated State. This perpetuated segregation inasmuch as all out-of-State Negro medical students, for example, were sent to virtually all-black Meharry Medical College in Nashville. White students benefited more because they had a wider interstate choice. Increasing appropriations to black State colleges was a third evasive device. Between 1938-39 and 1947-48, the per student expenditure for black land-grant colleges as compared with that for whites rose from 62.5 percent to 90.4 percent.[86] Unfortunately, none of the historic disparity that was so sizable by the 1930's was overcome even by the latter percentage since parity had not been achieved. Forcing each black applicant to litigate on his or her own behalf ensured a pattern of tokenism enforced later by the common schools.

Following *Brown II*, indications seemed firm that public higher education in the South would soon be desegregated. During 1955-56, Negroes in Texas won four court decisions based on *Brown* that opened all-white colleges to them.[87] In 1955, a Federal district court in North Carolina ruled that *Brown* applied to higher education; this decision was affirmed the next year by the Supreme Court.[88] In 1956 public colleges and universities in Tennessee were ordered to desegregate.[89] Neither in North Carolina nor Tennessee, however, did desegregation ensue. Segregated public higher education became a privileged enclave beyond the effective reach of the new constitutional doctrine.[90]

In 1968 segregated public higher education once more became an issue when Tennessee State officials were directed by a Federal district judge to desegregate the State's public colleges and universities. A 6-year delay followed before the court held hearings on specific plans. Meanwhile, the court action rekindled interest among Federal officials. At the same time, the Office for Civil Rights of HEW began notifying institutions that their Federal grants were being endangered by persistent segregation. In 1969-70, 10 States were directed to submit desegregation plans. Five States ignored the directive while the other five submitted unacceptable plans. OCR failed for as long as 3 years to make any formal determination of noncompliance. Federal funds continued to be awarded to and spent by the 10 States. A lawsuit was then filed against HEW and OCR to compel them to administer title VI in accordance with their own administrative regulations. Late in 1972, the suit was decided against the Government, in *Adams v. Richardson*.[91] Numerous postponements were granted the States as they sought approval of various plans. Suit was filed by the U.S. Department of Justice against Louisiana when it refused to submit a plan.[92]

Beginning in the late 1960's OCR began to enforce Federal Executive Order 11246, which forbade discrimination by any contractor with the Federal Government on account of race, color, nationality, or sex. Contractors were directed to formulate a plan for affirmative action to overcome existing disparities. Colleges and universities, many of them Government contractors, sought to fulfill the requirement.

It should be recalled, as described in the previous chapter, that American higher education as a whole had practiced systematic exclusion of black faculty for many years. Numerous qualified black academicians, who later become outstanding authorities in their field of research, were rejected from employment solely on the ground of race. A firm 100-0 quota had been enforced rigidly. Only in the past generation has this begun to change. The first 4 years of the OCR program brought exceedingly minor changes in colleges and universities. According to a study by the American Council of Education, the percentage of blacks on college faculties rose from 2.2 percent in 1968-69 to 2.9 per cent in 1972-73.[93]

By the mid-1970's, the constitutional law of higher educational opportunity could hardly be said to exist. In some respects it rested at the level of *Plessy*. Many of the measures offered to remedy segregation have turned out to be essentially steps to make predominantly black colleges "more equal." Others have consisted of proposals to increase the number of white students at the black colleges. Such actions resemble the state of desegregation judicial doctrine around 1958 and might be called "early *Brown*." Absent thus far are concrete plans for—or detailed judicial orders to create—unitary systems of public higher education. This stage might be called "late *Brown*" or "early *Green*."

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Roy Wilkins in Charles L. Sanders, "A Frank Interview With Roy Wilkins," *Ebony*, 29 (April 1974), p. 38: "At one time, the U.S. Supreme Court was actually considered as our enemy."

[2] See, for example, Frank J. Klingberg, *The Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina. A Study in Americanization* (Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1941), p. 105; Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, pp. 160-161; and John Hope Franklin, *The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860* (New York: Russell and Russell, repr. 1969), p. 168.

[3] See, for example, John H. Russell, *The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865* (Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press, 1913), p. 145.

[4] Robert H. Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America. A Documentary History. I: 1600-1865* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), pp. 316-317.

[5] See Charles T. Hickock, *The Negro in Ohio, 1802-1870* (Cleveland, Ohio: Williams Publ. and Electric Co., 1896), p. 81 and U.S. Commissioner of Education, *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States,* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1871), p. 343 (hereinafter cited as *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States*).

[6] See Bremner and others (eds.), *Children and Youth in America*, I, p. 438.

[7] *Chalmers v. Stewart*, 11 Ohio 386 (1842).

[8] *Lewis v. Henley*, 2 Ind. 334-335 (1850).

[9] *Jeffries v. Ankeny*, 11 Ohio 372 (1842).

[10] *Van Camp v. Board of Education of Logan*, 9 Ohio St. 415 (1859).

[11] See Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (New York: Oxford Univeristy Press, 1970), pp. 286-287; Woodson, *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861*, p. 335; *see Clark v. The Board of Directors*, 24 Iowa 272-273 (1868).

[12] *Roberts v. Boston*, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 210 (1849).

[13] See Lawrence D. Rice, *The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900* (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1971), pp. 212-213; John Hope Franklin, "Jim Crow Goes to School: The Genesis of Legal Separation in the South," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 58 (Spring 1959), reprinted in Charles E. Wynes (ed.), *The Negro in the South Since 1865* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1965), p. 140; and U.S. Commissioner of Education, *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States*, p. 347.

[14] *Claybrook v. Owensboro*, 16 Fed. R. 302 (1883).

[15] *Puitt v. Commissioners*, 94 N.C. 519 (1886).

[16] *Cumming v. County Board of Education*, 175 U.S. 545 (1899).

[17] Data in W.E.B. DuBois, "The Negro Common School, Mississippi," *Crisis*, (December 1925)

[18] *Bryant et al. v. Barnes, Tax Collector*, 106 So. 116 (1925).

[19] The fullest account of the movement can be found in Butler A. Jones, *Law and Social Change: A Study of the Impact of New Legal Requirements Affecting Equality of Educational Opportunities for Negroes Upon Certain Customary Official Behavior in the South, 1938-1955* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1955).

[20] Data in Welch, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," p. 900.

[21] Jones, *Law and Social Change*, p. 463.

[22] *Chase v. Stephenson*, 71 Ill. 383 (1874).

[23] *People v. McFall*, 26 Ill. App. 319 (1886).

[24] N. Dwight Harris, *The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and of the Agitation in That State* (Chicago, Ill.: McClurg, 1904), p. 242.

[25] Mary J. Herrick, *Negro Employees of the Chicago Board of Education* (Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1931), pp. 12-13 and *passim*.

[26] Mary J. Herrick, *The Chicago Schools*, manuscript copy, quoted in *Integrated Education*, 9 (September-October 1971), p. 58.

[27] *Pierce v. Union District School Trustees*, 46 N.J. 26 (1884).

[28] See Meyer Weinberg, *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 72-73.

[29] See New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored Population, *Report . . . to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey . . . 1939* (Trenton, N.J.: The Legislature, 1939), pp. 39-42.

[30] See Weinberg, *Race and Place*, *passim*.

[31] Leon Friedman (ed.), *Argument: The Oral Argument Before the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1952-55* (New York: Chelsea House, 1969), p. 12.

[32] Benjamin Muse, *Ten Years of Prelude. The Story of Integration Since the Supreme Court's 1954 Decision* (New York: Viking, 1964), p. 19.

[33] Friedman, *Argument*, p. 400.

[34] *Ibid.*, p 400.

[35] *Ibid.*, pp. 524-525.

[36] Robert L. Carter, "The Warren Court and Desegregation," *Michigan Law Review*, 67 (1968-1969), p. 243.

[37] Friedman, *Argument*, p. 104

[38] See Muse, *Ten Years of Prelude*, pp. 82-83; Robbin L. Gates, *The Making of Massive Resistance. Virginia's Politics of Public School Desegregation, 1954-1956* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1964), p. 56; and Willie Morris, *Yazoo. Integration in a Deep Southern Town* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 17.

[39] Jack W. Peltason, *Fifty-Eight Lonely Men. Southern Federal Judges and School Desegregation* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961). p. 100.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[41] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Civil Rights U.S.A. Public Schools Southern States. 1962* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), p. 4.

[42] Carter, "The Warren Court and Desegregation," p. 244.

[43] Martin Luther King, "Let Justice Roll Down," *Nation*, March 15, 1965, pp. 271-272.

[44] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Federal Enforcement of School Desegregation* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, September 11, 1969), p. 31.

[45] Mrs. Ruby G. Martin to John Veneman, January 31, 1969, in Barney Sellers, "Appendix Background Material," p. 1-65 in A. Philip Randolph Institute, *The Reluctant Guardians: A Survey of Federal Civil Rights Laws*, PB 192 346 (Springfield, Va.: Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, December 1969).

[46] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Southern School Desegregation 1966-'67* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967) p. 31.

[47] *Briggs v. Elliott*, 132 F. Supp. 777 (1955).

[48] *U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 372 F 2d (1966).

[49] *U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 380 F 2d (1967). Cert. denied 389 U.S. 840 (1967).

[50] *U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education*, 372 F 2d (1966).

[51] *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

[52] *Alexander v. Homes*, 396 U.S. 19 (1969).

[53] *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

[54] Paul V. Smith, "Pupil Transportation: A Brief History," *Inequality in Education*, No. 11 (March 1972), p. 16.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[56] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Public Schools. Southern States 1962*, pp. 97-98 and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *1964 Staff Report on Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 47.

[57] Data in U.S. Department of Transportation, School Bus Task Force, *Pupil Transportation Safety Program Plan* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1973), p. 3.

[58] See *ibid.*, p. 5 and Weinberg, *Race and Place*, p. 25.

[59] *Adams v. Richardson*, 480 F.2d, 1159.

[60] *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 491 N.6.

[61] *People ex rel. Cisco v. School Board*, 161 N.Y. 598, 600 (1900).

[62] *Matter of Central School District No. 1, Town of Ramapo*, 65 [New York] State Dept. Rep. 107 (1943).

[63] *Greathouse v. Board of School Commissioners of City of Indianapolis*, 198 Ind. 95, 101 (1926).

[64] *Matter of Alyce Bell*, 77 [New York] State Dept. Rep. 38 (1956).

[65] *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 199 F. Supp. 470 (1955).

[66] *Dobbins v. Commonwealth*, 198 Va. 697, 96 S.E. 2d 157 (1957).

[67] *In re Skipwith*, 180 NYS 2d 852, 46 R.R.L.R.264 (1958).

[68] See Weinberg, *Race and Place*, p. 57.

[69] *Bell v. School Board of the City of Gary, Indiana*, 324 F. 2d 209 (1963) and *Downs v. Board of Education of Kansas City*, 336 F 2d 988 (1964).

[70] See John Kaplan, "Segregation Litigation and the Schools–Part III: The Gary Litigation," *Northwestern University Law Review*, (May-June 1964); Owen M. Fiss, "Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Constitutional Concepts," *Harvard Law Review*, (January 1965); and Meyer Weinberg, "De Facto Segregation: Fact or Artifact?" *Integrated Education*, 1 (April 1963), pp. 30-33.

[71] *Booker v. Board of Education of Plainfield*, 45 N.J. 181 (1965).

[72] *Keyes v. School District No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973).

[73] *Integrated Education*, 12 (January-April 1974), p. 14.

[74] See *Integrated Education*: March-April 1971, pp. 35-39 (California); May-June 1972, pp. 70-74 (Washington), and July-August 1972, pp. 47-54 (Pennsylvania).

[75] *Integrated Education*, 9 (March-April 1972), p. 40.

[76] Section 5 reads: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." See Owen Fiss, "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Case and Its Significance for Northern School Desegregation," *University of Chicago Law Review*, 38 (Summer 1971).

[77] Horace Mann Bond, "The Negro Common School in Oklahoma," *Crisis, (July 1928), p. 245.*

[78] Louis R. Harlan, *Separate and Unequal Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), p. 210.

[79] Jacob Landers, "Profiles of Inequality in New York City," *Integrated Education*, 11 (January-February 1973), p. 3-14 and Richard A. Berk and Alice Hartmann, "Race and School Funds in Chicago, 1971," *Integrated Education*, 10 (January-February 1972), pp. 52-57.

[80] George N. Rainsford, *Congress and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century* (Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1972), p. 99.

[81] Gary Orfield, *The Reconstruction of Southern Education. The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act* (New York: Wiley, 1969), p. 8.

[82] Robert M. Sawyer, *The Gaines Case: Its Background and Influence on the University of Missouri and Lincoln University 1936-1950* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966), p. 161.

[83] *University of Maryland v. Donald T. Murray*, 169 Md. 478 (1936).

[84] Charles H. Houston, "Don't Shout Too Soon," *Crisis*, 43 (March 1936) p. 91.

[85] *Gaines v. Canada*, 305 U.S. 337 (1938).

[86] See data in James A. Colston, *State Financial Support of Higher Education in Georgia from 1932 to 1949 with Specific Reference to Higher Education for the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958), p. 118. These data cover 11 southeastern States.

[87] Jessie P. Guzman, *Twenty Years of Court Decisions Affecting Higher Education in the South, 1938-1958* (Tuskegee, Ala.: Tuskegee Institute, 1960), p. 22.

[88] *Frasier v. Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina*, 134 F. Supp. 589, aff'd, 350 U.S. 979 (1956).

[89] *Booker v. Tennessee Board of Higher Education*, 240 F. 2d 689 (1957), *cert. den.*, 353 U.S. 965 (1957). See also, Jack Greenberg, *Race Relations and American Law* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), pp. 260-267.

[90] See Reed Sarratt, *The Ordeal of Desegregation. The First Decade* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), chapter 5.

[91] *Adams v. Richardson*, 480 F. 2d. 1159.

[92] For political background on the issue of desegregation of higher education in Louisiana, see Leon E. Panetta and Peter Gall, *Bring Us Together. The Nixon Team and The Civil Rights Retreat* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Lippincott, 1971), pp. 330-331.

[93] *Integrated Education*, 11 (July-October 1973), p. 11.

CHAPTER 3
RACE AND INTELLIGENCE IN AMERICA

Over the broad sweep of evolution, man developed a cultural mode of existence. At the core of culture lay not only "a capacity for highly complex forms of learning," but as well "a capacity for transcending what is learned; a potentiality for innovation, creativity, reorganization, and change."[1] Both capacities were crucial from the outset since the earliest human civilizations were established in the face of awesome natural obstacles. On each continent adaptation was sought to the most varied challenges. During the some 150,000 generations of history and prehistory, men and women of every race demonstrated their capacity to learn, unlearn, and learn anew. While mankind came to differ in color, social and economic forms, and in other respects, only very recently did doctrines develop alleging that some persons were less capable of being fully human.

Race prejudice was not peculiar to slavery. Slavery in the ancient world and in medieval Europe and Asia did not, apparently, eventuate in labeling the slaves as inferior human beings. Most of these slaves were white.[2] Nor did anti-black prejudice require slavery for its succor. In the early Islamic world, such prejudice was widespread despite religious strictures against it.[3] Full-scale denial of the humanity of black slaves developed first in colonial America. By the mid-18th century, a way of thinking by white colonists emerged which conceived of the slaves "as primarily and merely physical creatures."[4] And in case nature should not attend to the new preachment, the legislature of South Carolina in 1740 forbade the instruction of black slaves. As black theologian Alexander Crummell later wrote of the enactment:

> It was done . . . with the knowledge that the Negro had brain power. There was *then*, no denial that the Negro had intellect. That denial was an afterthought.[5]

In the 1780's, Thomas Jefferson declared blacks to be intellectually inferior. He never withdrew this judgment. Blacks were thus excluded from his general prescription of education.[6]

Both in Europe and America, doctrines of racial inferiority became formalized by the 1850's. Such declarations, as a later black writer noted, "were always blessed with a singular freedom from effective protest."[7] Objections from blacks, however, persisted—even before the Civil War.

It was not a scholarly writer but the Judiciary Committee of the Ohio legislature that defended exclusion of black children from the common schools in 1834:

> . . . The security of our government rests and remains in the morality, virtue, and wisdom of our free white citizens . . . The common school fund is not the offspring of the offices of charity . . .[8]

To this practical racism black parents posited an equally practical opposition, not rhetorical but political. They conducted a statewide campaign to open the schools to their children; within 15 years they succeeded.

In opposition to direct contentions that blacks were inferior, black spokesmen canvassed a variety of refutations. These usually referred the detractor to a study of then-contemporary reality rather than learned subtleties. Black abolitionist Robert B. Forten declared: "And there are innumerable living instances . . . that the color of the skin affects not the elements of human nature, nor the principles upon which men move on from ignorance to knowledge and refinement."[9] Dr. James McCune Smith, physician and the leading black intellectual in New York City, declared in 1844:

> During the last 30 years, the Northern States have been the scene of a silent struggle . . . the free blacks [are] taught to believe themselves naturally inferior, barely admitted to common school instruction, shut out from the temple of higher literature, and taunted with ignorance . . . Freedom has . . . strengthened our minds by throwing us upon our own resources, and has bound us to American institutions with a tenacity which nothing but death can overcome.[10]

Blacks opened their own schools but would not give up equal claim to the common schools.

School boards somethimes made a weapon of the issue of intellectual inferiority in order to justify segregation. Black parents in Boston during the 1840's sought to abolish an all-Negro school. School authorities refused. In 1846, the school board majority dragged out a new argument–one that was to reappear a century later under more scholarly auspices. Of Negro children it was said:

> . . . Their peculiar physical, mental, and moral structure, requires an educational treatment, different, in some respects, from that of white children. Teachers of schools in which they are intermingled remark, that, in those parts of study and instruction in which progress depends on memory or on the imitative faculties, chiefly, the colored children will often keep pace with the white children; but when progress comes to depend chiefly on the faculties of invention, comparison, and reasoning, they quickly fall behind.[11]

Complaints like this were not heard in New Bedford, Salem, Nantucket, and Lowell where black and white children attended common schools. Nor should it be forgotten that in Boston's black school, the principal–probably the source of the above-described theory–was under heavy attack by Negro parents for racist and neglectful educational practices.

Allegations of inferiority were often put forward in the name of public opinion. Educator Horace Mann wrote approvingly to a Negro group in 1851; ". . . I suppose the almost universal opinion to be, that, in intellect, the blacks are inferior to the whites; while in sentiment and affection, the whites are inferior to the blacks."[12] He was answered by a public meeting of black citizens who denounced "that partial judgment which measures men by their complexion and stamps them with inferiority when their color or nationality appears unlike their own."[13] Black academician William G. Allen criticized Mann's racial theory, contending that blacks were not a distinct African race so much as "essentially a mixed race." Accordingly, strictly racial characteristics could not properly be delineated.[14] Black Boston lawyer John Rock summarized the Negro response to the allegations with his customary force: "Abject as our condition has been, our whole lives prove us superior to the influences that have been brought upon to crush us."[15]

After the 1860's, two new elements entered racist thought: imperialist expansion and the doctrine of evolution. In Europe as well as the United States, doctrines of racial superiority served to "justify" expansion into Africa. "Imperialism" writes Stocking, "not only nourished, but indeed required, theories of western European racial superiority,"[16] Africa was viewed by western historians as a land without history where a deadening sameness characterized the centuries. As two African historians noted later: "This attempt to cut the African adrift from his historical experience and in effect to undermine his basic humanity was the most upsetting feature of European colonialism."[17]

Darwin's evolutionary thought was soon translated into the same idiom. He had theorized that evolution depended on a process of natural selection, characterized by a struggle for existence within the various species of plants and animals. "Social Darwinists" transported this doctrine into the realm of human life and argued for a racist interpretation. First, they held, natural selection was tending toward pure races. Second, racial prejudice was adaptive toward this goal because it speeded up the eventual emergence of pure races.[18] Races and nationalities were placed on an evolutionary scale, which was led invariably by white Anglo-Saxon populations. In time, the theory arose that all races were capable of development but the lower ones required the guidance of higher ones. Lamarckianism, the belief in the inheritance of acquired characteristics, complemented the argument for race development. Thus could changes in the environment of "lower" races become their permanent acquisitions.

Around the turn of the century, some American social scientists began to develop the concept of culture. This view universalized the capacity to be human. During the early years of the new century, most social scientists rejected the idea that "racial differences were significant factors in determining cultural development."[19] By 1912, sociologist W. I. Thomas, who had believed otherwise a decade earlier, reported: "Present-day anthropology does not pretend that any of the characteristic mental powers, such as memory, inhibition, abstraction [or] logical ability, are feeble or lacking in any race."[20] Preeminent in the new stream of thought was anthropologist Franz Boas who held that all races were equally potential carriers of culture.[21] He wrote of the Negro: "We do not know of any demand made on the human body or mind in modern life that anatomical or ethnological evidence would prove to be beyond his powers."[22]

A number of social scientists retained beliefs in racial and ethnic inferiority. In 1904, sociologist Edward R. Ross wrote in the leading journal of his field that "the [N]egro is not simply a black Anglo-Saxon deficient in schooling, but a being who in strength of appetites and in power to control them differs considerably from the white man."[23] By the eve of World War I the doctrine of racial inferiority was less often stated than implied.

Racism took its toll in the various institutions of American society, including education, government, and economic life. Yet, the rise of formal justifications for racism strengthened the resolve of those who discriminated. As black intellectual W. E. B. DuBois wrote in 1901: "If the Negro will blindly go to the devil and make haste about it, then the American conscience can justify three centuries of shameful history; and hence the subdued enthusiasm which greets a sensational article or book that proves all Negroes worthless."[24] Some social scientists wrote anti-racist materials. Few attempted to establish institutional challenges to racism.

Boas was one of these. Around 1907, he began a long, fruitless attempt to gain foundation support to establish an African Museum which would "combine public exhibits with facilities for extensive scholarly research on the Negro."[25] The proposal was rejected by all major foundations. In 1910 he turned to the Smithsonian Institute's Bureau of Ethnology but officials rejected the idea as likely to arouse the "race feelings" of Congress as well as endanger the bureau's budget. Three decades later, Boas reported continuing failure of researchers to take up the subject of the Negro in America:

> . . . We have reason to be ashamed to confess that the scientific study of these questions has never received the support either of our government or of any of our great scientific institutions; and it is hard to understand why we are so indifferent toward a question which is of paramount importance to the welfare of our nation.[26]

The experience of Boas paralleled that of DuBois who also sought in vain to obtain foundation funds for a program of systematic research on the Negro.

THE USES OF GENETICS

Prior to 1900, knowledge of the mechanisms of genetic inheritance was more allegorical than scientific. Extremely little was known about precise paths of transmission of traits, or even about what was inheritable. Ignorance, however, was no bar to the growth of a body of intellectual speculation known as eugenics, i.e., the improvement of the quality of the human race. Much of the eugenic literature was little more than an intellectualization of dominant social prejudices. The existing social order was accepted as the standard of evaluation; position on the social scale was equated with relative quality. In the United States, eugenicists found the lower classes lacking in biological endowments possessed by successful Anglo-Saxon elements in the population. Eugenicists as a whole considered blacks to be biologically inferior to whites.[27]

After 1900, genetics became a modern science. That year, the pioneering experimental work of Gregor Mendel was rediscovered. In addition, Weissmann's disproof of the inheritance of acquired characteristics became known. With the knowledge that a single gene might control the inheritance of a single trait, the possibility of controlled breeding became apparent. Eugenics fastened upon the new knowledge and interpreted it within a framework of superiority v. inferiority. The lower class, for example, was said by Charles B. Davenport, a leading eugenicist, to have inferior genes.[28] In 1910, a Federal legislative commission concluded that "immigrants from Mediterranean regions were biologically inferior to other immigrants."[29] Objections to such interpretations were heard occasionally. Jacques Loeb, experimental biologist from the Rockefeller Institute, protested in 1914 that "there is absolutely no basis for saying that the color of the skin or the shape of the eyes, or any other bodily characteristic has anything to do with the intellectual or moral inferiority of an individual or a race."[30] A number of geneticists apparently disagreed; perhaps as many as half of all geneticists in the country became identified with the eugenics movement.[31]

Eugenicists were emboldened to make extremely excessive scientific claims for their beliefs. Science, it was declared, supported the advocacy of sterilization of the "unfit" and limitations on the further immigration of "inferiors" from southern and eastern Europe and elsewhere. By 1917, 16 States had passed sterilization laws. Immigration restriction became fact during the early 1920's. By then, most geneticists had become disenchanted with eugenics. Raymond Pearl, a prominent biologist and one-time eugenicist, charged in 1927:[32] "The literature of eugenics has largely become a mingled mess of ill-grounded and uncritical sociology, economics, anthropology, and politics, full of emotional appeals to class and race prejudices, solemnly put forth as science, and unfortunately acknowledged as such by the general public."

EMERGENCE OF INTELLIGENCE TESTING

The modern intelligence test originated in France. There, in 1904, a government commission resolved to establish special schools for the feebleminded. The commission decided that "no child suspected of retardation should be eliminated from the ordinary school and admitted into a special class, without first being subjected to a pedagogical and medical examination from which it could be certified that because of the state of his intelligence, he was unable to profit, in an average measure, from the instruction given in the ordinary schools."33 The goal, then, was to discover how to retain rather than reject a child. Alfred Binet's intelligence test, created in 1905, was designed to facilitate this goal.

Binet sought to ascertain not the child's learning but his intelligence. This latter he regarded as "judgment, otherwise called good sense, practical sense, initiative, the faculty of adapting oneself to circumstances. To judge well, to comprehend well, to reason well, these are the essential activities of intelligence."[34] Binet feared that the quantitative aspects of the test results might mislead psychologists to treat the child routinely or mechanically:

> Notwithstanding appearances it is not an automatic method comparable to a weighing machine in a railroad station on which one need but stand in order that the machine throw out the weight printed on a ticket . . . The results of our examination have no value if deprived of all comment; they need to be interpreted.[35]

The process of intelligence testing, in other words, "must be used with intelligence . . ."[36] Binet stressed, too, the personal consideration and kindness that testers owed the tested.

The role of cultural and social factors in intelligence was considered by Binet. At first, he declared confidently that "it is the intelligence alone that we seek to measure, by disregarding in so far as possible, the degree of instruction which the subject possesses."[37] It proved less possible than imagined. Binet made clear that the children with whom he worked were not from selected social groups but from Parisian working class families.

In a study of Belgian children, Binet found that "the intellectual level of the children is modified according to the wealth of the population."[38] This, he emphasized, was not an absolute rule. Indeed, in the Parisian schools he studied, it did not hold true. There he found little difference in achievement among children of varying social conditions. He attributed this outcome principally to the fact that "in the primary school . . . they all receive the same kind of instruction in class."[39] Also, the social contrasts were wider in Belgium than in Paris.

Binet stressed intelligence as a practical activity: ". . . The faculty of adapting oneself is the property of intelligence and . . . the power of adaptation is the measure of it . . ."[40] He regarded as "brutal pessimism" the view of intelligence as an unchangeable quantity. Instead, he proposed a system of "mental orthopedics" to raise the intelligence level.[41] In any event, intelligence tests were only one potentially useful means of reaching a judgment about a single child.

Transferred to an American setting, intelligence tests underwent fundamental changes. Within a decade after Binet's death in 1911, his invention was barely recognizable. H. H. Goddard, psychological director of a school for the feebleminded in

Vineland, N.J. adapted the test in accordance with his firm belief in the hereditary determination of intelligence level. Binet had rejected such a view, pointing out that teachers often fell into this error in explaining comparative performance of their students.[42] Goddard also held that intelligence was not the complex phenomenon that Binet postulated but rather an unambiguous single faculty.

In 1916, Lewis Terman of Stanford University revised the Binet test, giving it the name Stanford-Binet. It was modified in accordance with American conditions and standardized on 1,000 white children born in California of average social status. Terman believed that IQ tests would ultimately reveal "enormously significant racial differences in general intelligence, differences which cannot be wiped out by any scheme of mental culture."[43] Through his long tenure at Stanford, Terman retained his belief in racial differentials and taught the doctrine to a generation of educators. He was joined by Columbia University's E. L. Thorndike in teaching the hereditary basis of intelligence. Given the great influence of Stanford and Teachers College, Columbia University, large numbers of future teachers, school administrators, and researchers imbibed both doctrines.

During World War I, intelligence tests lost their character as individual testing instruments and became group tests. Binet had declared "it ... necessary ... to abandon the idea that a method of investigation can be made precise enough to be entrusted to the first comer."[44] A group of psychologists drew up two tests—Alpha and Beta—to help the Army select potential officers. Alpha tests were verbal while Beta tests were designed for non-English speakers. Rapidly trained testers administered the tests *en masse*. The tests were of practical value as officer candidates were selected on the basis of test scores.[45]

The scientific significance of the Army tests was less clear. Organizers of the testing effort were devotees of the American trend: They stressed the hereditary significance of intelligence, insisted they were discovering "native" intelligence, and interpreted test results in a racist framework.

In 1923, Princeton psychologist Carl C. Brigham wrote the authoritative analysis of the Army tests from this viewpoint. He reported that changes in the sources of immigrants were driving down American intelligence levels. As fewer persons of "Nordic blood" came, the number of persons from non-Nordic countries increased. "There can be no doubt," wrote Brigham, "that recent history has shown a movement of inferior peoples or inferior representatives of peoples to this country."[46] He asserted that, one could only deny "in the teeth of the facts, the superiority of the Nordic race ..."[47] Brigham equated the negative influence of non-Nordics with that of blacks. He wrote of "the most sinister development in the history of this continent, the importation of the [N]egro."[48] Critics had already observed that northern black recruits had scored consistently higher than southern blacks, thus casting doubt on any racial theory of intelligence.

Brigham agreed, in part. He wrote:

> The superior intelligence measurements of the northern [N]egro are due to three factors: first, the greater amount of educational opportunity, which does affect, to some extent, scores on our present intelligence tests; second, the greater amount of admixture of white blood; and third, the operation of economic and social forces, such as higher wages, better living conditions, identical school privileges, and a less complete social ostracism tending to draw the more intelligent [N]egro to the North.[49]

He concluded that it was "impossible to dissect out of this complex of forces the relative weight of each factor."

While Brigham made this admission, he nevertheless also held that the incorporation of blacks into the American "racial stock" produced a "taint" that Europe had been spared. Racial mixture—both via blacks and "inferior" Europeans—would, he predicted, accelerate the decline in American intelligence. He stated that further immigration must be strictly controlled and that in addition: "The really important steps are those looking toward the prevention of the continued propagation of defective strains in the present population."[50]

In 1924, Congress passed a general immigration statute that established quotas for each country. Immigrants from favored countries—the "Nordics"—were given higher quotas while those from "inferior" countries in eastern and southern Europe entered under lower quotas. Of the 27 States with sterilization laws by 1930, 20 had been passed since 1918, the end of World War I. Eugenicist works such as Brigham's were an important factor in the passage of this legislation.

The analysis of black intelligence contained in Brigham's book was an amalgam of old and new elements. Along with earlier commentators, he acknowledged that intelligence was in part, at least, a measure of one's education. (Why Brigham failed to apply the same reasoning to "inferior" immigrants is not clear.) He repeated the ancient tale that high black achievement reflected the presence of "white blood" in black achievers.[51] While about a quarter of the genes of American Negroes are derived from whites, neither in Brigham's day nor after was it possible to correlate skin hue with IQ scores. Explaining higher IQ scores by northern Negroes as being due to the migration of persons of superior intelligence was a fairly novel contention. A decade later, a standard work on psychological testing by Garrett and Schenck regarded the selective migration argument as unproven.[52] The general adequacy of the Alpha and Beta tests for a measure of "innate" intelligence was simply assumed by Brigham. In fact, so culture bound were the testmakers that they sought to determine innate intelligence on one question by asking which one of four different automobiles used the Knight engine.[53] Social prejudices were transformed into signs of innate intelligence in a series of questions purportedly testing "practical judgment."[54]

The public learned of the Alpha and Beta tests in 1919, the year following the end of the war. Colleges and other educational institutions started using the tests on a wide scale. Researchers also used them to probe into racial and ethnic elements of intelligence. Thus, Kimball Young, working at Stanford under L. M. Terman, wrote a dissertation based on use of the tests in six places in northern California: "...We must accept the facts that intellectual traits are to considerable if not complete degree transmissible and subsumable to the laws of heredity."[55] When he ranked the students by socioeconomic status, he found Anglo and Mexican American children differed greatly. Four out of 10 Anglo children but fewer than 1 out of 10 Mexican American children came from the 2 highest status groups; about 2 out of 10 Anglo children but nearly 7 out of 10 Mexican-American children came from the 2 lowest groups. Despite these sizable disparities, Young declared: "The writer stands firmly on the ground that the cause of school difficulties must be found in the more innate intellectual differences."[56]

Brigham and Young expressed an almost universal faith among American psychologists and educators that intelligence was innate and genetically inherited. Evidence to support the interpretations was exceedingly slim, consisting mainly of IQ scores of the alpha and beta type. Geneticists tended to stay away from the question inasmuch as they regarded their science as incapable of resolving it, at least at the then current stage of knowledge. This reticence only encouraged less qualified persons to speak out.

One geneticist, H. J. Muller a future Nobel laureate, did undertake an analysis in 1925. Referring to IQ tests, he wrote "...the *genetic* significance of these tests ... [is] most dubious."[57] In a study of a pair of 30-year-old identical twins who had been raised separately, he found they scored almost the same on both the Alpha and Otis IQ tests. "...For most individual sections of these tests ... when applied to persons of a given social class and territory," specified Muller, "they provide a fairly reliable index of genetic or inherent capability for work of this nature ...,"[58] He avoided commitments to any concept of general intelligence or to intelligence that transcended class and habitat. Such, in fact, was the prevailing conception in the educational and psychological literature. Muller also warned that his twin study could not support "the more sweeping conclusion ... That environmental influences in general would have little effect upon scores attained, because the twins were, after all, raised in the same kind of community, and in families of similar status ..." It was invalid to attribute the similarity of IQ scores to hereditary forces in the absence of any real environmental variation. A truer experiment would require each of the identical twins to have been placed in very different environments. All in all, Muller remarked, scientific studies should prepare one to appreciate "the great latitude of genetic indetermination to which many psychic characters of man must be subject."[59]

Muller's emphasis on the ideterminacy of human development was directly opposed to the dominant psychological-educational view. Little attention was paid to his study. Workers in other fields, however, also probed IQ tests and found reason to doubt the prevailing interpretations.

In 1922, Alexander reexamined the Army Alpha scores for white draftees and was struck by the apparent importance of schooling. To test this hunch, he correlated State median Alpha scores with State index numbers of school adequacy on a scale invented by Ayres. (The scale measured tangible factors such as teachers' pay, length of school year, and the like.) The States with the most adequate school systems were also those with the highest test medians. "... Army Alpha," concluded Alexander, "appears as a test of what has been learned rather than what *can* be learned."[60]

In 1924, a 20-year-old black student at the University of Chicago, Horace Mann Bond, replicated Alexander's study and found the correlation between Alpha and Ayres scores to be .74, an extremely high figure. Bond went further and studied the relation of black to white scores. He found that blacks from Illinois scored 47.35 while whites from four different southern states averaged 41.0.[61] The so-called racial differences in intelligence were social differences. It will be recalled that Brigham explained higher scores by northern Negroes as partly a consequence of selective migration. Bond speculated: "... One wonders how Mr. Brigham squares the facts of southern white deficiency with his theory?" Would Brigham, in other words, claim that the higher scoring northern whites had migrated selectively? Or, would he concede the overwhelming influence of differential opportunities? Leading testers, such as Terman, denied that racial status played anything other than a minor role.

Bond also viewed the issue from the viewpoint of the black community. "To the list of inferiorities to which the Negro is assigned," he wrote, "is [now] to be added one of helpless and unsurmountable natural mental deficiency; a barrier indeed difficult to hurdle."[62] Distribution of racist interpretations of the Alpha test results was socially destructive. Bond charged that "they have given to the professional race-hatred agitator a semblance of scientific justification for his mouthings, and, in the writings of popular and ill-informed publicists, they are rapidly molding a public opinion in support of the most reactionary and inequable measures of general policy and welfare."[63] He called upon every black university student to "comprise himself into an agent whose sole purpose is the contravention of such half-truths."[64] It should be recalled that the 1920's were marked by extensive lynching and comparatively low educational opportunity for blacks in the South. These oppressions were ignored by theorists of genetic-inferiority. No sensitive black observer could afford to forget them.

REORIENTATION DURING THE 1930's

During the 1930's genetics and eugenics in the United States came to a complete parting of the ways. When Hitler took power in 1933, he installed a far-reaching program of negative eugenics. In 1933, hereditary health courts were established to single out persons who were hereditarily defective and order their sterilization. Some quarter-million persons were sterilized. In 1939, euthenasia was legalized and during 1939-1941 about 50,000 persons were killed. American eugenicists praised the Nazi program of sterilization as exemplary. Geneticists in this country, however, were horrified at the distortion of their science, and began public attacks on the eugenicists. During the decade, reports Ludmerer, "among most geneticists there grew such a suspicion that human genetics would be used only for political purposes that many who might have contributed to the field now refused to do so."[65]

The spectre of Nazi racism also muted psychological and educational doctrines of racial intellectual inferiority. It failed, however, to encourage research in the area. At the 1940 annual meeting of the National Society for the Study of Education, a comprehensive yearbook on intelligence was presented. Paul Witty summarized research on the American Negro and observed that "one leaves the literature with the impression that the Negro child constitutes hopeless school material."[66] Leta Hollingworth spoke on the problem of comparative racial intelligence but did little more than bemoan the state of the field. She recommended "that in the proper course of events a whole yearbook in this series be devoted to the subject of racial characteristics, especially in regard to comparative mentality, as the matter bears upon the interests of school and society."[67] Apparently, no action was taken on this recommendation.

Curiously, such a study had been done 6 years before. Because, however, it was conducted under auspices of a black publication, it remained a non-event as far as the literature in the field was concerned. This was standard practice in American social science research.

For the July 1934 yearbook issue of the *Journal of Negro Education*, published by Howard University, the editor assembled an interracial group of specialists in intelligence and race. They represented a number of viewpoints. Editor Thompson had polled a number of outstanding psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, and educationists. He reported that "only 4 percent indicate[d] *unequivocally* that experimentation to date reveals any *inherent* mental differences."[68] Contributors to the journal kept their conclusions very much in line with those of geneticists in general. On racial differentials in intelligence, reported Dearborn and Long, "everywhere findings are inconclusive" and "inherent, mental inequalities among races have not been proved."[69]

University of Chicago psychologist Frank N. Freeman concluded: "It seems hardly possible . . . to secure data which will be unaffected by differences in environmental influence without a more widespread and radical control of social and economic conditions than a mere scientific experiment can provide."[70] (A decade earlier, Freeman had encouraged his student, Horace Mann Bond, to undertake a study of the Alpha tests.) District of Columbia school researcher Howard L. Long compared the IQ's of local black and white children. They were separated by 4.7 points. Long examined the conditions of segregation in the city to reveal how formal equality of condition was contravened by everyday realities. ". . . The wonder," Long concluded, "is not that the colored children of Washington fail to equal the whites in IQ score, but that their IQ's are as high as they are."[71] A veteran researcher in the field, Joseph Peterson, speculated about ultimate findings: ". . . We should not be surprised to find that racial differences in psychological traits (if any are finally proved to exist) may turn out to be differences in *emphasis only* of various capacities common to both races compared."[72]

Substantively, the special issue of the *Journal of Negro Education* constituted the most extensive discussion of intelligence and race then available. Its tone was balanced, its canvassing of prior research thorough, and its conclusions judicious. The scholarly world paid it little heed.

The 1930's witnessed a change of view by one of the principal architects of scientistic racism of the 1920's. Brigham, a few years after publication of his tract in 1923, wrote a private memorandum in which he labeled belief in native intelligence as "one of the most serious fallacies in the history of science."[73] IQ scores, he now held, were "a composite including schooling, family background, familiarity with English, and every thing else, relevant and irrelevant." In 1930, he published an article in which he reversed his earlier judgment and now held that "comparative studies of various national and racial groups may not be made with existing [intelligence] tests . . ."[74] He labeled as "without foundation" his own book which he judged "one of the most pretentious of these comparative racial studies." Unfortunately, as Weinland notes, "Brigham's recantation was not widely published and some continued to cite his book as evidence for racial differences . . ."[75] In 1932, he repudiated the conception of biologically inherited aptitudes and viewed them simply as ways of thinking derived from a specific culture. "From this point of view," Brigham wrote, "test findings would not be construed as necessarily revealing unalterable psychological characteristics of the individual, but merely as exposing what is happening to the individual in his culture."[76]

We have been told that heaven rejoices more over the arrival of one repentant sinner than over 10 holy men. It is different on earth. The harm done by racist ideologies could not be undone. Whereas Brigham's book had received an enormous amount of publicity upon publication, the retraction of its principal doctrines 7 years later was whisper-like.

While Brigham apparently did not explain his change of view in detail, one may guess at a possibly significant reason. Soon after 1923, he worked increasingly with the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) and eventually left Princeton to work at CEEB full time. The empirical realities of testing must have impressed him deeply. Any mystique that once attached to tests was soon dissolved. In 1932 he was ridiculing the "phantom formulae" of the testing movement's "pseudo-scientific contacts with laboratory psychology."[77] (That a bright black applicant had not the least chance of being admitted to Princeton—whatever his score on College Board exams—however, was a problem that Brigham did not reach.)

Before World War I, the most consistent social science stand against racial inferiority was taken by anthropologists. Their major spokesman was Franz Boas. This resistance continued during the 1920's and 1930's. Boas dealt on several occasions with the import of IQ scores and race. In his presidential address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1931, he declared:

> We do not need to assume that our modern intelligence tests give us a clue to absolutely biologically determined intelligence–whatever that may mean ... A careful examination of the tests shows clearly that in none of them has our cultural experience been eliminated ... There is no reason to believe that one race is by nature so much more intelligent, endowed with great will power, or emotionally more stable than another, that the difference would materially influence its culture.[78]

Boas continued to hold, as he had for years, that science knew no way to judge whether, in some ultimate sense, all races were equal intellectually. "It is hardly possible," he wrote in 1938, "to predict what would be the achievements of the Negro if he were able to live with the whites on absolutely equal terms."[79] Racists, Boas pointed out, were still unable to specify human behavior which was "characteristic of all genetic lines composing the race" and in which "considerable variations in the behavior of different genetic lines composing the race do not occur."[80]

Boas also stimulated research in the area of race differences. Otto Klineberg examined the hypothesis of selective migration as an explanation of higher black IQ scores in the North, but found it wanting.[81] Melville Herskovits studied the purported role of "white blood" in Negro behavior,[82] and denied that black behavior was affected by the presence of such "blood." He concluded that from a genetic point of view, the characteristics of a population depended on the capabilities of the ancestors. The racial character of the ancestors was unrelated to cultural behavior. Numerous other graduate students of Boas contributed to research on race differences.

As World War II was getting underway in 1939, the issue of race and intelligence had become relatively quiescent. The traditional eugenic position was largely discredited; at least it could no longer claim scientific support for its prescriptions. Scientific researchers defended their integrity more by criticizing those who misapplied research than by enlarging the pool of research findings. In the balance, neither the hereditarian nor the racial interpretation of intelligence had strengthened either case. Geneticists made no discoveries that invalidated Muller's open-ended position of 1925. In any event, some of the worst features of racial oppression had abated. Yet, this welcome development was indebted only in the smallest degree to the aid of social or biological scientists.

SINCE WORLD WAR II

During the first postwar decade, psychologists seemed to have stabilized their views on possible racial and social implications of intelligence testing. In 1947, Garrett, testing expert and chairman of the psychology department at Columbia University, wrote:[83]

> ... The differences between American Negroes and American whites are not true *racial* differences ... Comparison of Negroes and whites within the United States can hardly reveal true race differences ...

Seven years later, testing specialist Haggard criticized IQ tests for their overconcentration upon a narrow span of school abilities, and their ignoring of cultural and socialization processes in intelligence formation.[84]

A rebirth of scientistic racism followed issuance of the *Brown* decision in 1954. Shortly after the *Brown* ruling, Mississippi Senator James O. Eastland told the U.S. Senate: "Southerners know that legislation and court decrees are powerless to ... abolish distinctions based upon physical differences ..."[85] Two years later, W. C. George, an embryologist at the University of North Carolina, contended in a lecture at Dartmouth College that the Army Alpha tests of World War I had established the innate intellectual inferiority of blacks.[86] He warned, as had Senator Eastland, that desegregation would result in the debility of the white race.

During the decade after *Brown* the leader of the scientistic racists was psychologist Henry E. Garrett. As recently as 1947, he had denied the likelihood of racial differences in intelligence. Some time after his retirement from Columbia in 1956 and the beginning of his employment that year at the University of Virgina, he changed his mind. In none of his subsequent writings did he mention his previous views. Nor did he account for directly opposite interpretations of the same evidence.

In 1960 Garrett first published his new view of race and intelligence.[87] He criticized Otto Klineberg's analysis of selective migration. In 1933, Garrett had adopted a contrary evaluation of the hypothesis. Now, he also stressed the innate element in mental ability between races. Race mixture, he forecast, would have dire social consequences. No references were made to desegregation.

The following year, Garrett published a paper in a scholarly journal in which he attacked what he called "the equalitarian dogma."[88] By this he meant the view that denied the existence of racial differentials in mental ability. Garrett contended, to the contrary, that "Negro-white differences in mental tests are so regular and persistent as strongly to suggest a genetic basis."[89] Almost immediately, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) adopted a resolution stating that "there is no direct evidence that supports the view that there is an innate difference between members of different racial groups."[90]

Garrett replied by citing 13 studies; nine of these were published before 1957. An additional study came out in 1958. The remaining three references were to studies or sources that opposed Garrett's interpretation. Once again, therefore, a reversal in judgment was unaccompanied by an explanation.

From 1962 on, Garrett elaborated his viewpoint within the context of opposition to desegregation. He published articles in the principal organ of the (White) Citizens Councils of America, the main organizer in the South of opposition to desegregation. Large numbers of Garrett's pamphlets were distributed throughout the country. He testified in court suits, defending segregation in terms of the mental inferiority of blacks. In 1961, racial test differences "suggested" innate differences; by 1962, the evidence "strongly favored" the view that the differences were "probably genetic."[91]

A greater leap in his reasoning occurred in 1963 when Garrett testified in the *Stell* case, a desegregation action against Chatham County-Savannah, Ga. U.S. District Judge Frank M. Scarlett described the testimoney:

> Dr. Garrett than gave his opinion that the differences in educability between Negro and white children were inherent, and that only minor changes could be achieved by educational readjustment or other environmental change. There was no scientific possibility that learning rate differences of the degree shown by Dr. Osborne's tests and the confirming national studies were either caused by or could be substantially altered by the student's environment.[92]

Garrett also told the court that most of the higher scorers among blacks were those whose ancestors included white persons. The next year he more or less repeated his testimony in a desegregation case involving Jackson, Miss.[93]

In 1965, Garrett reported that "Negro-white mental differences are chiefly innate and are inherited."[94] On the basis of studies of twins, he continued, "differences between Negro and white children . . . can be predicted to arise in the ratio of three-to-one from heredity over environment." A year later, Garrett again held that heredity was far more important than environment: "nurture can work only with the tools supplied by nature."[95]

Before a U.S. Senate subcommittee chaired by Senator Sam J. Ervin, Garrett in 1967 testified on a civil rights matter. He stated:

> . . . Black people are immature relative to the white. They are more primitive, they are more childlike, their abstract intelligence is on the average considerably lower. All of the evidence . . . shows that . . . [with respect to] intelligence on the abstract level [the Negro] falls down . . . He doesn't have it . . .[96]

In 1968, he testified in a Federal desegregation proceeding in Mississippi. When a Government attorney asked for evidence in support of his statement that Africans were intellectually inferior to Europeans, Garrett pointed to the contrast between the Caucasian Gothic cathedrals of Europe and the black-built "mud huts of the Congo."[97] During his last year of life, 1973, Garrett once more revised a pamphlet in which he repeated every major argument he had put forward over the preceding 13 years.[98]

As one-time president of the American Psychological Association–in 1943–and as a Southerner who had "made good" up North, Garrett was a figure of some prestige. He became a celebrity of sorts as he shaped his doctrine into a weapon against desegregation. Neither courts nor legislatures based any lasting action on Garrett's doctrines. Southern school boards fighting desegregation found the doctrine a useful if secondary ideological weapon. The scientific content of Garrett's writings was exceedingly slender. Only seldom did he discuss opposing viewpoints. The most straightforward aspect of his material is the frank racism contained in it. Openly contemptuous of blacks and utterly convinced of the superiority of whites, Garrett was eager to place his theories into practice. A perfected segregation was his favored remedy. For the allegedly inferior blacks he prescribed separate black schools, controlled by Negroes and equal to those of whites. Garrett was overtaken by the practical progress of desegregation. By the opening of the 1970's his name sank into scholarly obscurity.

HUMAN BEHAVIORAL GENETICS

After World War II, scientists created a new coherent field–human behavioral genetics. Perspectives and methods that had proved productive in general genetics were being applied to man, wherever appropriate.

Curiously, at least to non-geneticists, the advance of genetical knowledge did not strengthen the viewpoint that organic life was "determined" by genetic processes. Rather, the greater the appreciation of genetics, the more open ended the organism's "future" seemed to be, as demonstrated by vastly expanded possibilities of plant and animal breeding. Geneticists, by altering both the hereditary and the environmental conditions of a plant, could produce a new plant. What of those qualities that distinguish man from other beings? Could these, too, be specified, measured, and controlled? What of human intelligence?

A standard approach to such inquiries is to seek the heritability ratio for the pertinent trait. Heritability describes the degree to which, at a given time, variations in a trait within a single population are related to genetic conditions. Varying values for an heritability ratio are obtained over an array of randomly selected environments. Where, however, environments have been deliberately manipulated for selected populations, heritability ratios are meaningless. The array of environments then consists of both privileged and disfavored types which cannot be equated. This effect is inherent in any racist or class society. If man were an experimental animal, to be shifted from one test environment to another, even such an obstacle could be overcome.[99] As Caspari notes, if one desires to understand behavior, it is not very helpful to arrive at an heritability ratio. The more important question "is how genetic individuality, which is a demonstrated fact, will express itself under the influence of diverse social and environmental conditions."[100] Similarly, Dobzhansky writes:

> Genes determine the pattern of the development in the sense that, given a certain sequence of environmental influences, the development follows a certain path . . . But the development of the carrier of a given genotype might also follow different paths in different environments.[101]

One might say, along with Gottesman, "heritability today and gone tomorrow."[102]

What fleeting light was cast on the heritability of intelligence? Since experimental manipulation of man is impossible in this area, the nearest to a "natural" experiment is to study the intelligence of identical twins. Since the pair may be said to share an identical heredity, any IQ differences between them may be attributed to environment. Clearly, if they are brought up in the same home, under more or less identical life circumstances, there is no "room" for variation of IQ. A test of relative genetic weight in determining IQ would require the separation of twins and their upbringing in greatly differing circumstances. So long as the twins share both a common heredity and a common environment, there is no way to separate the relative contribution of either factor.

Until 1973-74, the genetic and psychological literature cited a series of twin studies by Burt as the most extensive evidence that the heritability of IQ ran around .80.[103] This meant that 80 per cent of the variance of IQ scores within a population could be attributed to genetic inheritance rather than environment. In 1973, Kamin examined the evidence for Burt's findings and concluded:

> The numbers left behind by Professor Burt are simply not worthy of serious scientific attention . . . I see no unambiguous evidence whatever in these studies for *any* heritability of IQ test scores.[104]

Shortly afterwards, Jensen–who had earlier cited Burt's work very favorably–also restudied the Burt data.[105] He, too, concluded that the data were unreliable, though he did not withdraw his own earlier conclusion that twin studies established the heritability of IQ.

The genetic case for race differences in intelligence was almost nonexistent at mid-20th century. R. Ruggles Gates, a British geneticist who had argued for such differences, was widely regarded by many of his peers as a "racist or at best racist-influenced."[106] The subject became an issue of international debate in 1969 upon the publication of an article by Jensen, a psychologist.[107] In it he wrote that "there seems to be little question that racial differences in genetically conditioned behavioral characteristics, such as mental abilities, should exist, just as physical differences."[109] In the light of a persistent 15-point IQ lag of blacks in relation to whites, Jensen held, "it seems not unreasonable, in view of the fact that intelligence variation has a large genetic component, to hypothesize that genetic factors may play a part in this picture."[109] Further, he speculated that since lower class blacks had more children than middle and upper class blacks, that this "possible dysgenic effect", linked with current national welfare policies to help the poor, could lead to "the genetic enslavement of a substantial segment of our population."

Blacks–and poor whites as well as other ethnic minorities–were not deficient in every aspect of intelligence, according to Jensen. He contended that there were two varieties of intelligence: type I, which was expressed in memory and rote learning or what he called simple associative learning; type II, expressed in conceptual learning as in problem solving and an ability to handle abstract ideas. All children, according to Jensen, were more or less equal in type I intelligence. Poor and ethnic minority children, however, were seriously deficient in type II intelligence. These two types Jensen hypothesized as "two genotypically distinct basic processes."[111] In other words, they were genetically determined. Compensatory education, Jensen held, had failed and inevitably so, since educators were trying to develop type II intelligence in children who were genetically incapable of such reasoning. Schools, he insisted, must "find ways of utilizing strengths in children whose major strength is not of the cognitive variety [i.e., type II]."[112]

While Jensen stated the hypothesis of racial differences in tentative terms, his article treated it in every other respect as more or less established. For example, in discussing consequences of such a hypothesis, his terminology was more definite. His own viewpoint was apparently in a state of flux. Early in 1967–in a paper published the next year–he wrote:

> As far as I can tell from my search of the relevant literature, research on racial differences does not even begin to permit one to sort out the hereditary and environmental components of the demonstrated phenotypic differences in mental abilities. Therefore, statements concerning the relative importance of genetic and environmental factors in racial differences can at present be nothing but conjecture and surmise.[113]

He referred to "intellectually irrelevant racial characteristics such as skin color . . ."[114] In another article, published in 1967, he wrote, "Since we know that the Negro population has for the most part suffered socioeconomic and cultural disadvantages for generations past, it seems a reasonable hypothesis that their low-average IQ is due to environmental rather than to genetic factors."[115] Once more, in 1968, he wrote that "data that would permit firm conclusions about the genetic basis of differences among ethnic groups in measured intelligence do not yet exist."[116]

In 1969, less than a year later, Jensen reversed himself and abruptly found the hypothesis of a racial difference in intelligence reasonable. He neither took public note of the change nor did he cite any new, decisive evidence which had influenced the change. He failed to explain why he had reconsidered the implications of existing evidence. The transformation of viewpoint remained inscrutable, somewhat like Garrett's a decade earlier. Jensen denied he was a racist but his doctrine satisfied the central precondition of a racist thesis: it alleged an inborn inferiority based on race. Unlike Garrett, Jensen affirmed his belief in racial integration.[117]

During the 5 years following appearance of his 1969 article, Jensen wobbled on the question of evidence for racial differences. In addressing the American Educational Research Association in 1972, he counseled that ". . . it is probably wise for educators to assume an openly agnostic position with regard to the genetic issue as it involves racial differences . . ."[118] In 1973, he wrote in a popular magazine: "I do not claim any direct or definite evidence, in terms of genetic research, for the existence of genotype intelligence differences between races or other human population groups."[119] An English colleague of Jensen's wrote in 1972: "Both Jensen and I agree that the purely genetic evidence [about race differences in IQ] is indirect and inconclusive . . ."[120]

Some writers who agreed with one or another aspect of Jensen's writings, parted company with him on the matter of racial differences. Geneticist Crow wrote:[121] "It is clear . . . that a high heritability of intelligence in the white population would not, even if there were similar evidence in the black population, tell us that the differences between the groups are genetic." Psychologist Herrnstein stated:[122] "Concerning racial and ethnic differences in IQ, I am not ready to move from the agnostic position . . ." In examining Jensen's evidence psychologist Vernon expressed a view that" . . . I . . . doubt whether genetic differences in ability between such groups as American whites and Negroes are as important as this evidence seems to suggest . . ."[123]

Thus, neither Jensen nor his supporters succeeded in bringing forth evidence on behalf of his genetic hypothesis of racial inequality. Jensen's failure was not one of insufficient rhetoric nor of unfamiliarity with the findings of psychometry. It was simply an inability to produce relevant and binding genetic evidence in the precise area under contention.

Criticism of Jensen came from many quarters. Numerious geneticists expressed negative views about Jensen's racial hypothesis. Dobzhansky observed that ". . . class and race differences in IQ averages . . . may be genetic, which is pleasing to racists and reactionaries, but not espoused by any reputable scientist."[124] Bodmer reported:

> . . . Many geneticists, including myself, believe that there is no case on present evidence either for assuming, or for not assuming, the existence of a significant genetic component [in IQ differences between races]. The data are inadequate and the methodology for answering the question properly is not yet available.[125]

Cavalli-Sforza held that ". . . present knowledge gives no basis on which to draw any conclusion whatsoever on the genetic component of attributed behavioral differences among races . . ."[126] Both Lewontin and Hirsch came to the same conclusion.[127] They were jointed by Elias.[128] It should be noted that the Shuey book, so frequently cited by both Garrett and Jensen as an authoritative and comprehensive review of IQ studies does not contain, in the opinion of geneticist Gottesman, a "single study . . . [that] qualifies as a genetic analysis."[129] Yet, the book concludes that the 15-point IQ gap is genetically caused.

The evident failure of the genetic hypothesis to achieve confirmation or even factual support stimulated research into another biological direction—the possible significance of prenatal and early postnatal forces in shaping apparent IQ differences. Two special emphases emerged: material undernutrition and infant malnutrition. The significance of neither one has been definitively established.

The general situation has been summarized by Begab:

> Of the various factors associated with low birth weight and mental performance, malnutrition in the pregnant mother and the young infant may be the most significant and widespread. In the developing countries, 3 percent of the children, or 11 million, suffer from severe-calorie deficiencies. Moderate malnutrition embraces another 76 million. The blacks in our urban ghettos, the Indians, other minority groups, and the children of migrant farm workers are part of this population.[130]

Researchers at the University of Minnesota hospitals conducted a 7-year study of the effects of low birth weight—which is found disproportionately often among poor and minority children—on later educational progress. They concluded that low birth weight was associated with "impaired school progress as well as impaired performance on measures of mental development, language development, school readiness, and academic achievement from preschool through the early elementary school years."[131] The sample studied was 96.5 percent white. A predominantly black sample might have underscored the same conclusion. A question has been raised about the quality of the control groups used in the Minnesota study.

Sulzer, in a study of 300 black children attending Head Start programs in New Orleans, found that children with iron deficient anemia scored lower on IQ tests. Children with a record of past and present malnutrition, Sulzer found, suffered an "intellectual decrement of a generalized nature . . ."[132] A similar conclusion was reached by the Ross Conference on Pediatric Research which heard reports on intellectual functioning by iron deficient children who evidenced "a decreased ability to focus, orient, and sustain interest in a learning task."[133] Chase and Martin studied children 3½ years after their first year of life who had been characterized as malnourished. Comparing test and control groups, they found that "the intelligence or developmental quotients of the children with greater than 4 months undernutrition were 30 points lower than the control group and 25 points lower than the children who had short periods of undernutrition before diagnosis and intervention."[134]

Reversal of malnutrition effects has been demonstrated repeatedly although not invariably with the same degree of success. The most spectacular case is unfortunately not yet fully reported. Based, however, on unpublished reports by Rick Heber and his team at the University of Wisconsin, Begab recently communicated these results. The Heber group studied a group of poverty level black children in Milwaukee. A very broad span of special educational and social services was given to the mothers and children. After 5 years, according to Begab: "... The experimental children have a mean IQ of 125, the controls, 92. This disparity as well as the levels, have remained fairly constant from 3 years of age on."[135] Smaller scale successes are also reported.[136] Yet, the damage of early malnutrition may be so profound, that the original potential of the child is beyond retrieval.[137]

The main direction of nutritional research findings is in favor of a more open ended view of human capabilities--intellectual and otherwise. Likewise, attempts to conceive of human potential as fixed by genetic inheritance failed. As Lewontin has written: "What we are morally obliged to do is to eliminate blackness per se as a cause of unequal treatment and for that program we have no need of genetics."[138]

SUMMARY

The significance of two and a half centuries of slavery is not that black people were forever and irretrievably maimed by the experience. Rather, slavery deprived 4 million Americans of an opportunity to share in the benefits of an educational structure which their labor and taxes helped build. After slavery, American society incorporated within itself the institutional arrangements to perpetuate the unequal opportunity. The scope of the deprivation was so extraordinary that mere statistics cannot grasp its impact. For example, the ordinary measurement of IQ test scores involves a spread of modest proportions. Differences of 10 or so per cent are regarded as significant. But, as pointed out in chapter 1, in 1860 the ratio of white to black children in schools was about 27 to 1. The gap was not bridged until a century after *that*. Meanwhile other privileges accrued to whites. It is the institutional, not the genetic, burden of the past that created and maintains the broadest educational inequalities of the day.

Intelligence testing in the United States was from its earliest days intertwined with the anti-equalitarian doctrines of many of its leading practitioners. This ideology is part of the burden of the past. (It is examined in more detail in the following two chapters, especially in relation to the role of socioeconomic differences among students.) The rise of worldwide movements for equality has loosened the once secure position of dominance occupied by the IQ test. A half-century ago, the president of Cornell University could say soberly: "We have never had a true democracy, the low level of the intelligence of the people will not permit our having one."[139] Hardly anyone today would treat such an opinion with respect. In the educational world, however, ancient conceptions die hard.

Arguments about the role of heredity are products of environment, not heredity. They can probably never cease being considered in the absence of a society in which race is not a signal for deprivation. This would suggest that eventually, the argument will not so much be settled as fail to be raised.

FOOTNOTES

[1] A. Irving Hallowell, "Self, Society, and Culture in Phylogenetic *Evolution After Darwin*, vol. II: *The Evolution of Man* (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1960). For a summary of Hallowell's thinking, see Meyer Weinberg and Oscar E. Shabat, *Society and Man*, 2nd edition (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965) pp. 94-102.

[2] See Charles Verlinden, *The Beginnings of Modern Colonization.* Yvonne Freccero, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970.

[3] See Bernard Lewis, *Race and Color in Islam* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

[4] Winthrop D. Jordan, *White Over Black. American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1968), p. 232.

[5] Alexander Crummell, *The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect.* The American Negro Academy, Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The Academy, 1898) (emphasis in original).

[6] Jordan, *White Over Black*, p. 355.

[7] Charles S. Johnson, "Mental Measurements of Negro Groups," *Opportunity*, 1 (February 1923), p. 21.

[8] *Liberator*, May 3, 1834.

[9] *Liberator*, March 7, 1835.

[10] *Liberator*, February 23, 1844.

[11] *Liberator*, August 21, 1846.

[12] *Liberator*, May 14, 1852.

[13] *Liberator*, October 22, 1852.

[14] *Liberator*, November 26, 1852.

[15] *Liberator*, February 14, 1862

[16] George Ward Stocking, Jr., *American Social Scientists and Race Theory: 1890-1915* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1960), p. 80.

[17] J. F. Ade. Ajayi and E. J. Alagoa, "Black Africa: The Historians' Perspective," *Daedalus*, 103 (Spring 1974), p. 127.

[18] See Michael Banton, "1960: A Turning Point in the Study of Race Relations," *ibid.*, p. 33.

[19] Stocking, *American Social Scientists and Race Theory*, p. 498.

[20] Quoted in *ibid.* p. 510.

[21] See *ibid.*, p. 21.

[22] Franz Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, rev. ed. (New York: Free Press, 1963, orig. 1938; 1st ed., 1911), p. 240.

[23] E. A. Ross, "Present Problems of Social Psychology," *American Journal of Sociology*, 10 (1905) 468-469, quoted in Stocking, *American Social Scientists and Race Theory*, p. 501.

[24] W. E. B. DuBois, "The Storm and Stress in the Black World," *Dial*, (April 16, 1901), p. 264. See also, DuBois, review of A. D. Mayo, *The Mental Capacity of the American Negro* in *Journal of Philosophy*, 11 (September 24, 1914), pp 557-558.

[25] Edward H. Beardsley, "The American Scientist as a Social Activist: Franz Boas, Burt G. Wheeler, and the Fight for Racial Justice, 1900-1915," *Isis*, 64 (March 1973), p. 60.

[26] Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, p. 241.

[27] Kenneth M. Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society. A Historical Appraisal* (Baltimore, Md. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. 22.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[30] Jacques Loeb, "Science and Race," *Crisis*, 9 (December 1914), p. 92.

[31] Ludmerr, *Genetics and American Society*, p. 42.

[32] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 84.

[33] Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon, *The Development of Intelligence in Children (The Binet-Simon Scale)*, Tr. Elizabeth S. Kite (Vineland, N. J.: The Training School at Vineland, 1916), p. 9.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 239.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 323.

[40] Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon, *The Intelligence of the Feeble-Minded*, Tr. Elizabeth S. Kite (Vineland, N.J.: Training School at Vineland, 1916), p. 87.

[41] Read D. Tuddenham, "The Nature and Measurement of Intelligence," p. 488 in Leo Postman (ed.), *Psychology in the Making. Histories of Selected Research Problems* (New York: Knopf, 1962).

[42] Binet and Simon, *Development of Intelligence in Children*, p. 301.

[43] Quoted in Thomas Pogue Weinland, *A History of the I.Q. in America, 1890-1941* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970), p. 123.

[44] Binet and Simon, *Development of Intelligence in Children*, p. 240.

[45] For an analysis of the cool reception accorded the psychologists by Army officers, see Daniel J. Kevles, "Testing the Army's Intelligence: Psychologists and the Military in World War I," *Journal of American History*, 55 (1968) 565-581.

[46] Carl C. Brigham, *A Study of American Intelligence* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1923), pp. 204-205.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 210.

[51] This argument was still being used 50 years later; see Henry E. Garrett, *IQ and Racial Differences* (Cape Canaveral, FL: Howard Allen Enterprises, 1973), p. 11. See, also, however: J. St. Clair Prince, "Negro-White Differences in General Intelligence," *Journal of Negro Education*, 3(July 1934), pp. 435-437; Russel F. Green, "On the Correlation Between I.Q. and Amount of 'White' Blood," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 7(1972), Part 1, pp. 285-286; and Christopher Bagley, "IQ and Europid Link Is a Myth," *Times Educational Supplement*, March 8, 1974 (letter). On the problem of arriving at a reliable estimate of intermixture, see T.

Edward Reed, "Caucasian Genes in American Negroes," *Science,* 165(August 22, 1969), pp 762-768.

[52] Henry E. Garrett and M. R. S. Schenck, *Psychological Tests, Methods, and Results* (New York: Harper & Row, 1933), p. 203.

[53] Kevles, "Testing the Army's Intelligence," p. 576.

[54] See Brigham, *A Study of American Intelligence,* pp. 12-16.

[55] Kimball Young, *Mental Differences in Certain Immigrant Groups, Psychological Tests of South Europeans in Typical California Schools Bearing On the Educational Policy and on the Problems of Racial Contacts in This Country, University of Oregon Publications, No. 11 (Eugene, Oreg.: Oregon University Press, 1922), p. 8.*

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[57] H. J. Muller, "Mental Traits and Heredity," *Journal of Heredity,* 16(December 1925), p. 434.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 440.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 443.

[60] Herbert B. Alexander, "A Comparison of the Ranks of American States in Army Alpha and in Social-Economic Status," *School and Society,* 16 (September 30, 1922), p. 392.

[61] Horace Mann Bond, "What the Army 'Intelligence' Tests Measured," *Opportunity,* 2(July 1924), p. 202.

[62] Horace Mann Bond, "Intelligence Tests and Propaganda," *Crisis,* 28(June 1924), p. 62.

[63] Bond, "What the Army 'Intelligence' Tests Measured," p. 198.

[64] Bond, "Intelligence Tests and Propaganda," p. 64.

[65] Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Science,* pp. 135-136.

[66] Guy Montrose Whipple (ed.), *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture.* Part I: *Comparative and Critical Exposition* (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1940), p. 263.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 260.

[68] Charles H. Thompson, "The Conclusion of Scientists Relative to Racial Differences," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3(July 1934), p. 511 (emphasis in original).

[69] Walter F. Dearborn and Howard H. Long, "The Physical and Mental Abilities of the American Negro: A Critical Summary," *ibid.*, pp.544-545.

[70] Frank N. Freeman, "The Interpretation of Test Results with Especial Reference to Race Comparisons," *ibid.* p. 522.

[71] Howard L. Long, "The Intelligence of Colored Elementary Pupils in Washington, D.C.," *ibid.*, p. 222.

[72] Joseph Peterson, "Basic Considerations of Methodology in Race Testing," *ibid.*, p. 408 (emphasis in original).

[73] Matthew T. Downey, *Carl Campbell Brigham* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1961), p. 27.

[74] Carl C. Brigham, "Intelligence Tests on Immigrant Groups," *Psychological Review,* 37(January 1930), p. 165.

[75] Weinland, *A History of the IQ in America, 1890-1941,* p. 242.

[76] Brigham in *A Study of Error* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1932), pp. 248-249, quoted in Downey, *Carl Campbell Brigham,* p. 28.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[78] Franz Boas, "Race and Progress," pp. 11-14 in *Language and Culture* (New York: Macmillan, 1940).

[79] Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man,* pp. 28-29.

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 227.

[81] Otto Klineberg, *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935); see, also, "Cultural Factors in Intelligence-Test Performance," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3(July 1934), 478-483.

[82] Melville J. Herskovits, "A Critical Discussion of the 'Mulatto Hypothesis' ", *Journal of Negro Education,* 3(July 1934), 389-402. See, also, William B. Provine, "Geneticists and the Biology of Race Crossing," *Science*, 182 (November 23, 1973) 790-796.

[83] Henry E. Garrett, "Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the United States", *Scientific Monthly,* 65(1947) pp. 329 and 333 (emphasis in original).

[84] Ernest A. Haggard, "Social Status and Intelligence", *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* 49(1954) 141-186.

[85] Sen. James O. Eastland, *The Supreme Court, Segregation, and the South* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954), p. 6.

[86] W. C. George, *Race,Heredity, and Civilization. Human Progress and the Race Problem,* 4th ed. (London: Britons Publishing Society, 1963; orig. 1961), pp. 30-31.

[87] Henry E. Garrett, *Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology. A Review* (Reprinted from *The Mankind Quarterly,* [1(July 1969)]).

[88] Henry E. Garrett, "The Equalitarian Dogma", *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine,* 4(1961) 480-484.

[89] Henry E. Garreett, "The S.P.S.S.I. and Racial Issues", *American Psychologist,* 17(May 1962), p. 1 (reprint).

[90] Quoted in *ibid.*

[91] Henry E. Garrett, *Desegregation: Fact and Hokum* (Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, [1962?]), p. 24.

[92] *Stell v. Board of Education of Savannah,* 220 F. Supp. 241 (1963).

[93] *Evers v. Jackson,* 232 F. Supp. 241 (1964).

[94] Henry E. Garrett, "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work", *Citizen,* 10(October 1965), p. 5.

[95] Henry E. Garrett, "How Classroom Desegregation Works", *Citizen,* 10(February 1966), p. 20.

[96] Henry E. Garrett, "Garrett's Stuff", *Integrated Education,* 6(March-April 1968), pp. 42-43.

[97] Henry E. Garrett, testimony in *U.S. v. Hinds County School District,* October 8, 1968, page T-415 of court transcript.

[98] Garrett, *IQ and Racial Differences* (Cape Canaveral, Fl.; Howard Allen, 1973)

[99] Gerald E. McClearn, "The Inheritance of Behavior", p. 210 in Postman, *Psychology in the Making.* See, also, David Layzer, "Heritability Analyses of I.Q. Scores: Science or Numerology?" *Science,* 183(March 29, 1974), pp. 1259-1266.

[100] Ernst W. Caspari, "Behavioral Consequences of Genetic Differences in Man: A Summary", p. 275 in J. N. Spuhler (ed.), *Genetic Diversity and Human Behavior* (Chicago, Ill. Aldine, 1967).

[101] Theodosius Dobzhansky, "On Types, Genotypes, and the Genetic Diversity in Populations," p. 9 in *ibid.*

[102] Irving I. Gottesman, "Statement", p. 38 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1972) (Hereinafter cited as *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement*).

[103] See Cyril Burt, "Inheritance of General Intelligence", *American* Psychologist, 27(March 1972), pp. 175-190.

[104] Leon J. Kamin, *Heredity, Intelligence, Politics, and Psychology*, 1973, unpublished, pp. 11 and 14. See, also, "Text of Dr. Kamin's Presentation Denying that Proof Exists that IQ Test Scores Are Hereditary", *South Today*, 4(May-June 1973), pp. 1-5.

[105] Arthur R. Jensen, "Kinship Correlations Reported by Sir Cyril Burt", *Behavior Genetics*, 4(March 1974), pp. 1-28.

[106] Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Science*, fn. 10, p. 138.

[107] Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(Winter 1969), pp. 1-123.

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[109] *Ibid.* p. 82.

[110] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[113] Arthur R. Jensen, "Social Class, Race and Genetics: Implications for Education", *American Educational Research Journal*, 5(1968), p. 23.

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[115] Arthur R. Jensen, *Educational Research*, 10(November 1967), pp. 4-20, quoted in Philip E. Vernon, *Contemporary Psychology*, 15(March 1970), pp. 161-162.

[116] Arthur R. Jensen, in Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 9.

[117] See Arthur R. Jensen, "Statement . . . Before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee", *Congressional Record*, July 1, 1970, p. H 6325: "I personally favor racial integration and I hopefully believe it is coming about."

[118] Arthur R. Jensen, "On 'Jensenism': A Reply to Critics", *Education Yearbook, 1973-74* (New York: Macmillan, 1973) p. 295.

[119] Arthur R. Jensen, "The Differences are Real", *Psychology Today*, 7(December 1973), p. 86.

[120] H. J. Eysenck, London *Observer*, March 2, 1972 (letter), quoted in Jennie Laishley, "Some Perspectives on Race and Intelligence," *New Community*, 2(Spring 1973), p. 192.

[121] See James F. Crow, "Genetic Theories and Influences: Comments on the Value of Diversity," *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(Spring 1969), p. 308.

[122] Richard J. Herrnstein, *Atlantic Monthly*, 228(December 1971), p. 110.

[123] P. E. Vernon, "Vernon on Jensen," *New Society*, December, 14, 1972, p. 645.

[124] Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Genetic Diversity and Human Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 20.

[125] Walter F. Bodmer, "Biomedical Advances–A Mixed Blessing?" The Herbert Spencer Lecture (1973?), typescript, pp. 18-19.

[126] L. I. Cavalli-Sforza, "Statement," U.S. Congress, *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement*, p. 3.

[127] See Richard C. Lewontin, "Race and Intelligence," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 26(March 1970), pp. 2-8 and "Further Remarks on Race and the Genetics of Intelligence," *ibid.*, 26(May 1970), pp. 23-25; and "Herrnstein's Sleight-of-Hand," *Harvard Crimson*, December 11, 1973: "The methodological problem of estimating the genetic component of the differences between groups in human populations is as yet unsolved and no experiment performed or proposed has ever come close to doing so." See, also, Jerry Hirsch, "Behavior-Genetic Analysis and Its Biosocial Consequences," *Seminars in Psychiatry*, 2(1970), pp. 89-105.

[128] M. F. Elias, "Disciplinary Barriers to Progress in Behavior Genetics." Defensive Reactions to Bits and Pieces," *Human Development*, 16(1973), p. 129.

[129] Irving J. Gottesman, "Biology, Social Structure, and Equality," U.S. Congress, *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement*, p. 44. Reference is to Audrey M. Shuey, *"The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, 2nd ed. (New York: Social Science Press, 1966).

[130] Michael J. Begab, "The Major Dilemma of Mental Retardation: Shall We Prevent It? (Some Social Implications of Research in Mental Retardation)," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 78(March 1974), p. 525.

[131] Rosalyn A. Rubin, Cynthia Rosenblatt, and Bruce Balow, "Psychological and Educational Sequelae of Prematurity," *Pediatrics*, 52(September 1973), p. 361.

[132] Jefferson L. Sulzer, Wesley J. Hansche, and Frederick Koenig, "Nutrition and Behavior in Head Start Children: Results from the Tulane Study," p. 104 in David J. Kallen (ed.), *Nutrition, Development and Social Behavior, Proceedings of the Conference on the Assessment of Tests of Behavior from Studies of Nutrition in the Western Hemisphere* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973).

[133] Harold P. Martin, "Nutrition: Its Relationship to Children's Physical, Mental, and Emotional Development," *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 26(July 1973), p. 768.

[134] *Ibid.* See, also, David Baird Coursin, "Nutrition and Brain Development in Infants," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 18(April 1972), pp. 177-202 and Steven Rose, "Environmental Effects on Brain and Behavior," in Richardson and Spears with Richards (eds.), *Race and Intelligence*, p. 139.

[135] Begab, "The Major Dilemma of Mental Retardation,"

p. 527. For preliminary reports, see Rick Heber and Howard Garber, "An Experiment in the Prevention of Cultural-Familial Mental Retardation," pp. 478-493 in U.S. Congress, *Environment, Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement* and Rick Heber and others, *Rehabilitation of Families at Risk of Mental Retardation* (Madison, Wis.: Rehabiliation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, University of Wisconsin, December 1972). For a more skeptical view of the Heber research, see Ellis B. Page, "Miracle in Milwaukee: Raising the IQ," *Educational Researcher*, 1(October 1972), pp. 8-10 and 15-16.

[136] See Martin, "Nutrition," pp. 772-773.

[137] See *ibid.*, p. 768.

[138] Lewontin, "Further Remarks on Race and the Genetics of Intelligence," p. 25.

[139] George B. Cutten, quoted in Weinland, *A History of the IQ in America*, 1890-1941, p. 172.

CHAPTER 4
THE POSSIBILITIES OF LEARNING

A few days after reaching London in 1846, Frederick Douglass, black abolitionist and fugitive slave, wrote to his friend, William Lloyd Garrison: "There is no distinction [here] on account of color. The white man gains nothing by being white, and the black man loses nothing by being black."[1]

While later researchers have cast doubt on the accuracy of this judgment, the logic of Douglass' distinction stands. Essentially, he was defining racial equality as freedom from penalty for being black and the nonexistence of privilege for being white. One implied the other. Racism, with its advocacy of both penalty and privilege, pervaded American education in Douglass' time. It continues to do so today. While protest movements have chipped away successfully at the penalties, privilege is still more or less intact. In current law, privilege occupies a lofty position beyond the reach of litigation and legislation. Douglass would have no difficulty in recognizing this continuity between his age and the mid-1970's.

In the world of educational research, however, history is absent. Problems of minority education are discussed without reference to the long-term oppression and exploitation inherent in slavery. Yet, it is the rootedness and not the agedness of history that is ignored. As indicated in chapters one and two, the abolition of slavery was followed – after a short interlude – by new systems of oppression that were incorporated within the educational and other institutions of American society. The consequences of these changes persist. By ignoring them, many social scientists are left with theories that place the burden of providing educational opportunity upon the very persons who were deprived of such benefits. Such theories are welcomed by public authorities and others who are thereby relieved of civic responsibility for the effective operation of the institutions under their jurisdictions.

During the 19th century, noneducation of minority children was achieved simply by physically excluding them from school facilities. During the first 75 years of the 20th century, protest movements -- especially among blacks -- put a stop to this policy. Instead, an ideology of deprivation developed that limits the "amount" of schooling on the ground of social need and the presumed fitness of the individual student. Unceasing objections to restrictive approaches such as these have became typical. Nevertheless, an educational system based on penalty and privilege continues to produce its own justification. Either by advocacy or acquiescence, much of educational research portrays inequality as unavoidable. Cut off from the past, the child is seen as caught in a deterministic web of immediate circumstance, in an environment restricted to the here and now. History is deemed irrelevant; the larger aspects of the society and culture of the child are put aside.[2] What remain are individual learners and non-learners, single schools, and, at best, yesterday's events.

At times, labels are accorded closer attention than the realities they symbolize. Thus, elaborate statistical operations are performed upon particles of information such as the occupation of a child's father, his income, or the extent of his schooling. This is done in the name of learning about the child's "social class". But the day-to-day life of the child in his social milieu and the interaction of the school with that milieu is only rarely studied. Further, the child's schooling experiences are seldom seen as they intersect the institutional orders of society. The antihistorical bias of much of social science is thereby joined by an anti-institutional orientation.

During the early 1960's, as Dickinson observes, the "large-city programs in 'compensatory education' direct [ed] most of their efforts toward compensating for or circumventing the supposed lacks of the children, and very few toward meaningful changes in the schools themselves."[3] The same orientation characterized the mainstream of educational and sociological research. Central to this view was the role assigned to "social class". Educational outcomes were found repeatedly to be statistically associated with social class position. (The latter was most often defined in terms of family income, occupation of breadwinner, and education of parents.) Commonsense logic suggested also that schooling would be distributed along the lines of relative social privilege. Numerous commentators warned that schools were incapable of altering this almost inevitable consequence of class society. Since higher academic achievement and even measured intelligence were regarded as objective properties of social class position, even advocates of equal opportunity stipulated that desegregation of poor with poor would be unproductive. Only when lower class children joined with middle class children was there a chance for improved achievement.

Curiously, the precise mechanisms whereby symbols of class became impediments or encouragements to learning remained unspecified. That low achievement and low social class were somehow involved in a causal relationship was regarded mysteriously as self-evident. Proponents of this line of reasoning also usually assumed that social class was a thing that one "had" or "had not." If one "had" it, certain events were triggered: with higher income, one learned more or was more able.[4] No allowance was made for the possibility that the school was itself part of social class, that it responded to children in the spirit of this or that class. Such an alternate view conceived of the school and its personnel as "doing class" when children of certain groups systematically failed to achieve or even to appear capable of achieving. School board members, administrators, and teachers could logically be said to play a role in determining academic and other school outcomes. Yet, researchers tended to avoid such an assumption. Social class became little more than a slender collection of material possessions which unaccountably fitted or unfitted children to learn. Researchers resisted alternative conceptions.[5]

But race suffered an even greater eclipse in most educational research. In general, a child's race came to be equated with its skin color. Investigators correlated skin color with almost endless rows of specific "factors" such as academic achievement, school facilities, and the like. When, for any reason, a statistical correlation between race and something else emerged, it was declared that a "relationship" existed. There were hundreds of such correlations –some smaller, some larger. The possible significance of any of them was often said to be submerged by social class. If black students were found to learn more in a desegregated school, it was also observed that the wealthier black children learned even more. Thus, the increased achievement was dubbed a "class effect" rather than a race effect.

In American society, however, one's race *is* a fact of social class. The distribution of goods, services, and life chances is intimately affected by race. Slavery, of course, was the starkest illustration of this fact. The school as well as the society customarily assigns black children a fate rather than a career. The character of this assignment cannot be grasped as an aspect of epidermal hue but as a feature of the political system. It is this broader aspect of race that has all but escaped not only educational researchers, but social scientists as a group. In 1959, the black sociologist E. Franklin Frazier observed:

> ... The political aspects of race relations have been neglected, especially in the United States. By political aspects I am referring to political institutions and the power structure which are so important in shaping the relations of persons with different racial backgrounds.[6]

In reviewing problems of race and education, it is still the unusual study that takes into account power relations between black and white communities.

Since 1925, much research effort has gone into ascertaining comparative mental ability of children of different races. As was pointed out in the preceding chapter, there is no genetic evidence to support the existence of such differences. In the process of this fruitless enterprise, however, valuable negative lessons have been learned. One of these deals with the inseparability of race and class in our present society. No one has yet found how to isolate experiences and learning attributable either to race or class alone.

In the early 1920's, the psychologist Brigham, at the time a firm believer in racial and national inferiority, nevertheless conceded that "if we compare Negroes only to those whites who live in the same neighborhood, and who have had the same educational opportunities, our differences are smaller than those obtained by comparing samples of the entire white and Negro population."[7] In other words, the more alike in life circumstances, the smaller the differences in average IQ scores. Yet, Brigham resisted this principle in general. In comparing the IQ of black and white children, he noted that "to select children of equal education, age for age, in the two groups, is to sample either superior Negroes or inferior whites."[8] This was close to saying that the natural intellectual condition of blacks was low, and of whites, high.

More recently, researchers without racist preconceptions have explored the same area. Nichols and Anderson studied IQ performance of two groups of white and black children. Half lived in Boston and the rest in Baltimore and Philadelphia. The Boston children were of a low, but similar social class rating; the others were of a higher rating. Children were administered two standard IQ tests - the Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale For Children (WISC). Scores of the higher class Boston white children were about 15 IQ points above the scores of black children from both the other cities. When, however, black and white were compared *within* each location, the difference was only 6 points in Boston and 4.2 points in Baltimore–Philadelphia. Nichols and Anderson concluded that the IQ difference was socioeconomic in nature.[9]

Scott and Smith studied the usefulness of traditional socioeconomic measures, such as IQ of mother and education of mothers, in explaining IQ's of their children. The subjects were 38 black and white children in Waterloo, Iowa. They fell into two groups – those whose IQ and achievement rose over 5 months and those who failed to show any change. The mothers of both groups had essentially the same IQ scores. What differentiated the two groups of children was not maternal IQ but the kind of parent-created home conditions that favored study and intellectual growth. All the families were very poor.[10] This finding helps disturb the tendency to view social class affiliation as determinative of achievement and capability.

Zigler and colleagues set out to examine another aspect of the same problem: Do the persistently low IQ scores of poor and black children represent their basic intellectual capacity? The researchers doubted this was the case. They noted how suspicious and distant the children were toward the adult testers. What would happen if special steps were taken to win the confidence of the children and thereby motivate them toward higher performance? Two studies were conducted in New Haven, Conn., to test the possibility. Initial IQ scores were quite low. Indeed, in one group of 54 poor black children, fully 30 scored below 80, the cutoff for placement in special classes for the retarded. A retest 1 week later was preceded by measures of reassurance. Increases in IQ scores were highly significant. Among the poor and black children average improvement was 10 IQ points. One out of five improved scores by 20 or more points. Zigler and associates hold that these findings "support the view that disadvantaged children approach testing situations with a general situational wariness which results in their obtaining IQ scores beneath the level dictated by their cognitive competence."[11]

Numerous educational researchers have dwelt on a persistent 15-point discrepancy between white and black children as indicating an inborn difference. The Zigler study is only one of a number demonstrating that much of this gap can be reduced by factors under control of the school. More are cited later in the chapter.

In assessing the intellectual ability of minority children, what significance is to be extracted from consistently low scores? Alfred Binet, near the beginning of the present century, had ridiculed the automatic labeling of children as a consequence of deriving a – or any – single quantitative score. He had compared the practice with the receipt of a printed card bearing one's weight upon depositing a coin in a machine. Yet, this is more or less present practice in intelligence testing.

Psychologist Wallace Kennedy led a team of researchers who standardized the Stanford-Binet IQ test on southeastern black children. They found that black children lagged about 20 points behind the national average. When the scores were correlated with socioeconomic position, there was a spread in averages of 26 points. Kennedy cautioned, against interpreting the low scores literally: "The clinician in the field has learned that a Negro child who, in spite of the cultural deficits facing him, scores an IQ of 100 must be a superior child indeed to surmount these enormous difficulties."[12] Dreger reports the same phenomenon: "As a number of those who are familiar with both [black and white] cultures have remarked, individuals from the black group who score 10 to 15 points lower on 'standard' intelligence tests operate in 'real life' situations indistinguishably from their white counterparts."[13]

All the children in Kennedy's studies – one in 1960 and a followup in 1965 – attended segregated schools. He was struck by the fact that IQ of the children did not change over the interim. (Academically, however, they continued to decline relative to white children.) This may profitably be compared with experience in Starkville, Miss., where in 1968 black children in grades four, five, and six lagged 26 IQ points behind those of whites.[14] Schools were all but completely segregated at the time. In the same town or nearby, 3 years later, Moorehead studied the effect of desegregation upon the IQ's of black children. She found IQ rose significantly for those children who had experienced 2 full years of desegregation but no effect for those with only 1 year.[15]

IQ scores may be invisibly depressed by other factors. One that has been discussed increasingly is the race of the tester. Sattler, in a review of the literature, reports that on cognitive tasks for younger black children, especially, results are better if a black tester is used.[16] Savage conducted a unique study of tester effects by distinguishing between segregated and nonsegregated schools. He used schools in Chicago, Evanston, and Glencoe, Ill. On the WISC test, he found a smaller black-white score discrepancy in the nonsegregated schools. With respect to tester influence, however, he found unexpectedly that black children in the nonsegregated school scored higher when black testers were used.[17] White children in the same school did equally well with testers of either race.

Contrariwise, Barnebey, working in two nonsegregated schools in Ohio, found no difference in IQ scores among third-graders whether white or black testers were used.[18] In a study of 224 black and white children, ages 8 to 11 years, in Buffalo, N.Y., Solkoff likewise found that white testers did not produce lower scores for black children.[19] Johnson and Mihal conducted in Rochester, N.Y., a small-scale study in which they tried to neutralize not only the race of the tester but the tester as such. In short, they compared black and white IQ performance on tests administered by a human tester and by a computer. Using the Cooperative School and College Ability Tests (SCAT), researchers found that blacks and whites scored the same on the verbal part of the test by computer. When using the traditional paper test, however, blacks scored lower than whites. White students scored higher on the quantitative tests on both computer and paper.[20]

"It is striking," reports Sattler, "that white experimenters can at times serve to stimulate the performance of black college students ..."[21] He was referring principally to the research of Irwin Katz and colleagues. Recently, (1972) Katz tried to determine the effect of experimenter's race on the black college student's motivation for intellectual achievement. He used testers of both races and informed the students variously as to the group with whom they would be compared. Katz found that "white-norm subjects scored higher with a black tester and black-norm subjects scored higher with a white tester."[22] That is, if black students think they are going to be compared with other black students, they do better with a white tester. On the other hand, Katz also found that black students with a black tester scored higher if compared with whites than with other blacks. The Katz group stressed that in the absence of the issue of motivation, little useful information could be learned about student performance and race of tester. Thus, Dyer found no tester effects in three black and three white colleges in the South. She experimented to see if permitting students to practice made any difference; it did not.[23] She did not, however, analyze the possible role of motivation.

Few areas of research have revealed as much about the active role of the school in learning – or the prevention of it – as studies of mentally retarded children. Mercer has made what is perhaps the single most valuable extended study of the subject. She conducted a complete mental retardation census of Riverside, Calif. Schools and law enforcement agencies were found to be the most frequent reporters of poor and minority children as mentally retarded. By far most of these cases were determined as such by administration of some kind of intelligence test. Without teacher referral for testing, there was little chance of a child being characterized as retarded. Yet, teachers in Riverside did not refer proportionately greater numbers of Mexican American and black children. Once the children were tested, however, failure rates were especially high among poor and minority children. Among this group, the children actually placed in classes for the retarded were even more disproportionately poor and minority.

Many of the children classified by IQ as retarded, Mercer found, were able to operate quite satisfactorily in terms of adaptive behavior. She reported that "from 70 to 90 per cent of the Blacks who fail the IQ test at various levels pass the adaptive behavior scales at those levels."[24] (It will be recalled from the preceding chapter that Binet had stressed the fundamental importance of adaption in intelligence.) Most of the children managed quite well even though their IQ scores proclaimed their inability to do so. Mercer observes:

> ... Many persons are labeled as mentally retarded only by the public schools. Many are not regarded as mentally retarded until they age into the school system and many are no longer regarded as retarded when they leave the purview of the schools.[25]

When one adds that very many of these misclassified are poor and minority children, as Mercer demonstrates, it is easier to understand her further conclusion: "Intelligence testing perpetuates the subordinate position of non-Anglos in American society."[26]

The work of Adams underscores certain points made by Mercer. In two studies he explored the relationship of measured intelligence to adaptive behavior; the work was conducted in a State institution in Chicago. Both psychologists and physicians, he found, put the greatest store in intelligence tests. Physicians, he discovered, even when an examination showed considerable adaptive behavior, frequently subordinated their own clinical judgment to that of the psychological–i.e., test–evaluation.[27] Black children in the institution scored 11.5 IQ points below a norm group on the Stanford-Binet. On a measure of adaptive behavior, however, they were equal to the norm group. Thus, comments Adams, "Negro children are classified upon the basis of the type of measure on which they score especially poorly."[28] Corresponding differential treatment was also found by Shannon in his study of children referred to the Detroit public schools psychological clinic during the years 1911-1970. "Caucasian students," he reports, "were allowed to repeat more semesters in regular grades before being evaluated and placed in special classes, than did (sic) Black students."[29]

Evidence that a standard IQ test such as the WISC was differentially effective as between black and white in identifying retarded children was presented by Bowles' study in Pinellas County, Fla.[30] A total of 100 black and white children were tested first during May-June, 1965; and retested during December, 1966-January, 1967. Results were as follows:

Test	IQ Below 80	IQ Above 80
Black	40	12
White	36	12
Retest	**Below 80**	**Above 80**
Black	19	33
White	36	12

Since 80 is the customary cutoff between retarded and nonretarded, it is possible that the year and a half at a special school was extraordinarily effective only for black children. More likely, Bowles concludes, the change supports a view that "many of the Negro subjects who had been identified as being retarded prior to their being assigned to special education schools were retarded only in their abilities to produce satisfactory scores on the test instrument used, and were not necessarily retarded to their intellectual potentials."[31]

ETHNIC LEARNING STYLES?

Do children in various ethnic groups have distinctive learning styles, attributable to their group membership? A century ago, it was widely believed that races and nations had characteristic types of mental abilities and even temperaments. This belief faded away in the light of expanding knowledge of the basic similarity of mankind. Will the belief in ethnic learning styles turn out to be any more soundly based? In 1965-75, the subject became a growing area of research.

In 1965, Lesser and associates sought to discover the relative importance of ethnic and social class factors in cognitive functioning among children in the New York City area.[32] With reference to mean scores for the verbal, reasoning, numerical, and spatial components of mental ability, distinctive patterns among Chinese, Jewish, Negro, and Puerto Rican children were observed in the following order from high to low:

Verbal: Jewish, Negro, Chinese, Puerto Rican
Reasoning: Chinese, Jewish, Negro, Puerto Rican
Numerical: Jewish, Chinese, Puerto Rican, Negro
Spatial: Chinese, Jewish, Puerto Rican, Negro

It was also found that within each ethnic group, middle class children scored consistently higher than lower class children. Nevertheless, the ethnic patterns were far more striking than the social class patterns. As for the practical educational consequences of these findings, the authors stated in 1965 that "we have not yet attempted to relate these patterns of ability to school performance."[33] In 1967, the researchers again noted that "we do not yet know if attribute patterns associated with ethnic group membership will, in fact, be identified as educationally important."[34] Nor did an additional 7 years produce such a study of educational applications by the researchers.

In 1973, Feldman held that the Lesser "rank orderings on sets of mental ability measures tell us little about the intellectual strengths and weaknesses of ethnic groups."[35] The group patterns were of some significance, conceded Feldman, buth they could not be interpreted as valid indicators of intellectual strengths and weaknesses of most members of each group. Lesser replied that his data had established the existence of ethnic patterns and that this was all he had set out to do. At the same time, he wrote that he had always regarded the patterns as relative, not absolute: "For example, eacn ethnic group's pattern surely will change depending upon the different ethnic groups included in the sample."[36] The Lesser research has no demonstrable educational application, but many writers have referred to it over the past decade as though it did.

In Hawaii, two studies are relevant to the possible educational importance of ethnic and social factors in mental ability and achievement.

Stewart and associates studied 10th graders in Hawaii and tested them in December, 1960 and April, 1963, when they were in the 12th grade.[37] Both mental ability and academic achievement were measured. Japanese and Chinese students scored highest; Caucasians, next highest; Filipinos, next; and Hawaiians, lowest. Over the 28-month period, mean scores increased for all ethnic groups, except the Hawaiians.[38] Unfortunately, the ethnic effect was beclouded by the free interplay of a number of significant factors. The researchers mention that "these cultural groups vary widely with respect to factors such as tradition, degree of acculturation, family customs, and speech habits."[39] Many teachers in Hawaii are Asians.

A rare longitudinal study of 635 children in Hawaii was conducted by Werner and associates.[40] All born in 1955, the children were tested first at age 2 years and then again 8 years later. At the earlier age, Japanese children had the highest mean IQ score (103) and Filipinos the lowest (95). Socioeconomic differences did not seem to affect these scores. At age 10 years, Caucasian children scored highest (112), Japanese children second (109), and Portuguese lowest (96). On a scale of school achievement problems, Caucasian and Japanese children had the least; Hawaiians and Filipinos, the most. At the later age, socioeconomic influences left mental ability and achievement unaffected. Thus, Werner and associates stress the coherence and stability of the ethnic factor. On the other hand, they pointed to parental stimulation received at home as a major factor. "In the majority of the Japanese homes emphasis is placed on the value of education, on disciplined work habits, and esteem for intellectual pursuits, even where the parents may not have had much education."[41] Ethnic style was seen by the researchers as an aspect of the family rather than as psychological structure.

Smith studied the possible presence of ethnic learning styles in the Job Corps.[42] He visited the Job Corps Centers at Harpers Ferry, Schenck, Wellfleet and Kilmer; and two vocational high schools in Baltimore, one all-black, the other 86 percent white. He concluded that ethnic styles were superficial; upon close examination, they disappeared. As Smith explained:

> When the proportion of Negroes is low, Negroes group together and maintain low interaction rates with other members of the group. They exhibit sterotypic behaviors, rhythms, slowness, docility, highly slurred, dialect speech, etc. When the proportion is high, Negro behavior differs ... Interaction with others is greatly increased. The sterotypic behaviors disappear and in their place are substituted highly political, power-conscious behaviors.[43]

In the predominantly white school in Baltimore, Smith found, Negro students were treated equally with white students and responded in typical "good student" style. The matter was quite otherwise in the all black school in which no real achievement was expected of students, and none resulted.[44]

Lesser and associates had found, among other observations, that ethnic style was more important than social class and that social class had its greatest effect on mental abilities of Negro children. On both counts, Sitkei came to different conclusions.[45] Comparing 50 white and Negro middle and lower class children, averaging 4 years of age, he found that "ethnic and social class categories affected the group profiles in an equal fashion."[46] On only one of the six factors in Guilford's Structure of Intellect was there a greater social class effect for Negro children than for white children.

Burnes, in a study of 78 Negro and white children in St. Louis, averaging 8.5 years of age, found that "there is no evidence in favor of Stodolsky and Lesser's suggestion of patterns of abilities within cultural-racial groups. In fact ... configurations of scores are more similar for socioeconomic classes."[47] A study by the Canadian psychologists Irvine and Sanders concluded that, on statistical grounds, the Lesser findings on blacks were highly exceptional in view of the small samples involved, and thus were of limited potential for generalization.[48]

In 1969, Feldman completed a study of ethnic factors in the development of spatial thinking. It was conducted in San Francisco and involved black, white, and Chinese children. He sought to discover whether data would support the view that "groups differ in their rate of cognitive development, but do not differ in the capability to achieve abstract thinking."[49] How a child could benefit from instruction in an abstract thought exercise would thus depend on the acquisition of certain skills and their acquisition in a certain sequence. A child at a given age might not yet have developed certain skills sufficiently to solve the problem. In that case, it would be important to get a picture of the child's ability over a period of time. Consequently, Feldman used fifth, seventh, and ninth graders.

The children were asked to draw a map of the school and the school grounds from above. Performance on the test ranged from Chinese (high) to black (low). (This was also the order of IQ scores for the three ethnic groups.) Nevertheless, all children followed more or less the same sequence in acquiring certain skills and concepts without which the map could not have been drawn successfully. Feldman was not certain but conceded it possible that the particular sequence could be different for each group. By using a school learning task, Feldman was better able than Lesser to relate his study more closely to possible educational implications. On the other hand, there seems to be little real difference between the essential findings of both studies.

Larsen and Allen, working in northeast Georgia, studied IQ differences with reference to the role of race, sex, socioeconomic level, and community size. Subjects were 289 5-year olds enrolled in 13 urban and rural kindergartens. In no case did they find race alone related to IQ performance. Always other factors seemed also to be operating.[50] In this sense, no strictly ethnic pattern was found.

Backman investigated possible ethnic patterns of 3,086 12th graders of Jewish, white, black, and Oriental background. They were drawn from the national TALENT study made in 1960 and followed up 5 years later. Significant differences were found with respect to patterns of abilities as related to ethnic and socioeconomic factors. These differences were very small. Some, however, were quite unexpected. Negroes, for example, scored as high as Jews on visual reasoning. On perceptual speed and accuracy, they scored as well as non-Jewish whites.[51]

But with reference to the shape of mental patterns, ethnic and socioeconomic differences were almost completely eclipsed by sex differences. In short, Backman concluded, "for a given ethnic group males and females tended to exhibit patterns of mental abilities characteristic of their sex; these patterns were only slightly modified by ethnic background."[52] Lesser, Backman recalled, had found no sex factor at work. But, she observes, her sample consisted of high school seniors while Lesser's was made up of first graders. Perhaps, Backman concludes, sex differences in mental patterns are learned and thus emerge only with age. This imaginative suggestion is consistent with much that is being learned about sexism in American society and education.

Rivers conducted a mental patterns study in University City, Mo., a middle class suburb of St. Louis. He tested 195 black and white children, 6th through 12th grade, and 50 junior college freshmen. The groups were comparable in socioeconomic status. Distinct ethnic patterns of mental ability were found, especially for children enrolled in the sixth through ninth grades. No significant differences, however, were found for children in 10th through the 12th grades. Rivers was unable to single out any factor or combination of them which could explain the change that occurred.[53]

Using Piaget-type tests, Stokes studied patterns of cognitive development among black and white primary graders, apparently in the Detroit metropolitan area. These tests try to get beyond simple school-related performance in an effort to uncover the basic structure of the child's mental ability. In general, he found the pace of cognitive development to be slower among black children than among whites, as well as among those of lower than middle socioeconomic position. These averages, however, cloaked important differences. Stokes also found that black and white children performed similarly on tests of seriation and classification. Both black and white children of the middle socioeconomic position performed without significant difference on the cognitive tasks in general. Middle class black children exceeded general performance of lower class white children.[54] It may be concluded that Stokes demonstrated the existence of group patterns but these could not be regarded as racial or ethnic in character.

Miller approached the problem of ethnic patterns by studying black, white, and Mexican American children in the Aldine, Tex., school district. Basing his tests on Cattell's conceptions of fluid (concept formation and abstraction process) and crystallized (reasoning through previously learned concepts) intelligence, Miller found ethnic patterns to exist. Further, he concluded, members of each used their distinctive patterns of abilities in their own way of achieving school objectives.[55] The latter point was not established other than by extrapolation of test results.

In Columbus and Grove City, Ohio, Reiss studied 80 black and white male students, ages 6 to 10 years attending four segregated schools. She also compared test performances with and without "orientation" or preparatory periods. After socioeconomic differences were taken into account, there was no significant IQ difference between children of low socioeconomic status. Middle class blacks, however, lagged significantly behind middle class whites in IQ and differed importantly in cognitive styles. Within each racial group, low socioeconomic children with an orientation period equalled the IQ of children of higher socioeconomic status. Reiss observes that in a nonsegregated school, blacks could be expected to increase their performance levels. She also wondered whether she had actually studied two directly comparable groups when she classified black and white children into the middle socioeconomic position.[56] Strictly speaking, an ethnic pattern was not established.

In New York City, Leifer probed into ethnic patterns of 80 Chinese, black, Italian, and Puerto Rican children. In the ability to copy geometric shapes, no differences emerged. With regard to three other areas—construction, body awareness, and verbal ideational fluency—the groups differed significantly.[57] To a degree unmatched by other researchers, Leifer stressed the cultural aspect of group patterns. "The significantly higher scores earned by Chinese ... in constructional tasks and in understanding of body parts suggest," Leifer writes, "that the Chinese culture provides practice and reinforcement in these capabilities."[58] Since blacks constituted one of the other groups in her study, she was in effect contending that the black pattern was cultural and not racial in a genetic sense.

A study similar to Backman's was conducted by Flaugher and Rock. The similarity lay in use of a nationwide survey done earlier for another purpose. In Project Access, 1,780 male high school juniors from Los Angeles, Memphis, and the District of Columbia were drawn from black, white, Mexican American, and Oriental groups. They were of a low socioeconomic level, although the authors do not supply much information on this aspect of the study. Flaugher and Rock found no evidence of ethnic patterns of mental ability. Like Backman, who had reached a similar conclusion, they emphasized the possible importance of age composition of the group.[59]

In 1972, Marjoribanks performed a most elaborate and resourceful study. Most previous researchers, from Lesser on, were concerned with only two variables—ethnic group and test performance. When they were found associated, the data were held to be evidence, that an independent entity existed—known as an ethnic pattern of mental ability. Only a few investigaters hesitated to take this step, pending consideration of further factors. Some confessed ignorance about the interplay of unseen influences but were convinced that such elements were at work.

Marjoribanks set out to investigate possible interrelations of ethnic group and mental ability. In addition, he took into account in a major way the impact of the learning environment of the home. This would enable him to distinguish between effects attributable to ethnic membership from those resulting from forces operative in the home. His subjects, 11-year old boys, all born in Canada and attending English language schools, were either Canadian Indians, French Canadians, Jews, southern Italians, or white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. They came from 37 families of each ethnic group—a total of 185 families.

Under learning environment, Marjoribanks included the following:

1. Press for achievement
2. Press for activeness
3. Press for intellectuality
4. Press for independence
5. Press for English
6. Press for "ethlanguage"
7. Mother dominance
8. Father dominance

Socioeconomic status was established according to the education and occupation of the head of the household. Mental abilities tested were verbal, number, spatial, and reasoning.

The ethnic groups were found to be significantly different both in profiles and levels of the four mental abilities. (The former referred to the relative shape of a curve expressing the highs and lows of scores within any of the ethnic groups; the latter, to the size of score on any specific ability as between ethnic groups.) More important, Marjoribanks found that the home learning environment also influenced both profiles and levels of mental abilities. In other words, what had previously been regarded as an ethnic group effect was shown to be, at least in part, a resultant of home environment. How to disentangle the separate effects of ethnic group and home?

The following table summarizes Marjoribanks' findings:60

Criterion	Environment	Ethnicity	Covariation of environment and ethnicity
Verbal	16.0	11.0	34.0
Number	19.0	3.0	31.0
Spatial	5.6	n.s.	n.s.
Reasoning	14.0	6.0	n.s.

In general, ethnic group effects were scaled downwards once home learning environment forces were taken into account. For spatial ability, the weak ethnic group effect disappeared altogether. Ethnic group effect held up best for the verbal and number abilities. (Feldman's observation about the possible importance of age in developing certain cognitive abilities, prompts suggestion that the ethnic effect for verbal and number abilities might be further diminished if age effects were considered.) It should also be noted that the force of the eight-factor home learning environment was observed in its existing state. There is no reason why its impact could not be heightened by deliberate action. Nor is there much basis for denying the potential additional effect of that other learning environment called "school".

Marjoribanks succeeded also in specifying four of the eight learning environment forces that had an especially large impact on differences in children's cognitive performance, regardless of cultural group. These consisted of the presses for achievement, activeness, intellectuality, and "ethlanguage." While the study, because of its locale, did not deal with blacks, Mexican Americans, or Puerto Ricans, one might expect parallel findings to be obtained in a similar study in this country. Marjoribanks' already considerable contribution could be expanded if the research design were also to take into account the role of school learning environments.

The existence of ethnic learning styles is still problematic, even more so than in 1965. Too many studies since then have found the ethnic factor receding as additional factors are examined. The research effort, even if finally proved fruitless, will have been useful in at least one respect–further weakening of the overly rigid determinism that much research has attached to formal class and racial membership. By so doing, it may direct our attention to maximizing learning in the schools.

More than 40 years ago, black social scientist Horace Mann Bond wrote:

> There is no more reason for teaching Negro children a certain kind of arithmetic, or reading, or history, on the basis of their lower scores taken in the gross than there would be to have a special curriculum for the white rural children of the South as compared to the urban white children of the section or of the North.[61]

Bond hesitated to declare black children unsuited to learn from a standard curriculum when only rarely had they been given an opportunity to succeed at it. Bond's advice remains timely.

THE CULTURAL FRAMEWORK

During the 1950's, when confidence in the dependability of IQ measures was still rather high, some workers tried to create new tests that would be "culture-free". The concept of human beings without culture was anthropologically naive. As Washburn wrote: "There is no more reason to expect a culture-free intelligence than a diet-free stature."[62] Attention turned to the alternative of a "culture-fair" test. The logic of this step was just as unsatisfactory. Essentially, a culture-fair test would be based on material so familiar or strange to everyone that nobody would conceivably have an advantage. But a test built on either a banal or an arcane basis would bear little or no resemblance to any known social reality. Thus, both culture-free and culture-fair tests would seek primarily to categorize children according to criteria that are distant from their everyday lives. Still missing would be positive acknowledgement of the integrity of every culture–individual by its nature, unlike any other–and consequent efforts by the school to accept all children as eligible candidates, along with their culturally individual ways. *The acceptability of the children, not of the test, is the real issue.*

At an international conference on testing held in Turkey in 1971, prime emphasis centered on how people adapted to the difficult natural and economic conditions under which they lived rather than how they acquired specialized skills to guarantee success in schools. The editors of the conference proceedings, Cronbach and Drenth, summed up the sense of the conference in a single query: "Are tests to be used to adapt people individually and collectively to the presently dominant model of Western industrial society, or are they to uncover human potentialities to which cultures can be adapted?"[63] Participants seemed bored with the prospect of more or even better intelligence testing in the traditional sense. Many were dissatisfied with what they regarded as the narrow conception of man held by intelligence testing.

Feuerstein, an Israeli psychologist, told the conference of extraordinary progress registered by Oriental Jewish children who had been rated as retarded by traditional IQ tests. To search only for average performance is to neglect and even "actively reject" evidence that the child has potentials for growth: "We stress the high point in performance as an indicator of the person's true capacity, rather than an overall index which ignores the high point."[64] Testing may be followed by assignment of some children to children's villages and other collective organizations which, according to Feuerstein, prepare the great majority successfully to work with other children.

Other participants reported work which strengthened confidence in society's ability to develop children's educational performance. The Norwegian researcher, Thrane, told of his study of the contribution of formal schooling to the cognitive growth of adolescents:

> For each additional year of schooling, mean reasoning scores increased by 3 or 4 points. Those with no further schooling improved about 10 points, but the change was much greater (20 points) for those who stayed in school the whole time ... Evidently formal schooling was a powerful but not the only differentiating factor in the development of the cognitive functions examined.[65]

Numerous studies presented at the conference reported that score differences between groups of children almost always diminished as various socioeconomic factors were controlled.

"The papers and discussions," according to Cronbach and Drenth, "called insistently for greater attention to the assumptions underlying psychological research and practice, and for a redirection of research effort."[66] This approach implied that conventional intelligence testing had lost much of its authority. Until recently, such testing had been accepted in its own terms and few suspected that it was based on anything but a few technical assumptions. However, as more of the world, including the United States, has become less complacent about an educational system that ill serves poor and minority children, intelligence testing is increasingly viewed in its capacity to perpetuate inequality. The 1971 conference was a symbol of the need for new directions rather than a resolution of all the outstanding problems.

The same basic drive for equality originating outside school walls is increasingly felt on the American testing scene. One significant form is the Piaget-type test, touched on earlier. While the amount of research along these lines is still quite slim, certain tentative points are clear.

An advantage claimed for these tests is that they are relatively free from social and cultural influences in the sense that they are eliciting evidence on a purportedly universal system of cognitive growth. As Elkind puts it, "Piaget is concerned with those structures which, if they hold true for the individual, also hold true for the species."[67] It is no wonder that defenders of traditional intellegence testing, and thus of the inevitability of a social hierarchy of cognitive functioning, often are antagonistic to Piagetian testing. Evidence that "Piagetian" tests are also subject to environmental forces is cited triumphantly.[68]

"Piagetian" tests, according to Jensen, even lend support to his contention that racial-genetic elements are major factors in determining "Piagetian" cognitive functioning. In a 1969 article, Jensen cited a single study to support this argument. It was done in 1966 among Australian aborigines and part-aborigines by de Lomos. According to the findings, the former showed distinctly poorer performance than the latter on conservation performance–involving the ability to see that a change in shape of a container does not affect the volume of the contained material. She attributed the differential more to the presumably greater "white" genes in part-aborigines as suggested by their lighter skin hues.[69] Jensen accepted this interpretation.

Virtually unnoticed, however, was a replication of the de Lomos study 5 years after the original. Conducted by Dasen, of the University of Geneva, Switzerland, the restudy was highly unusual; seldom are replications made at all and rarely are they done at the same location with the same population. Dasen failed to confirm de Lomos' findings.[70] Not only did he fail to find a *racial* effect, as de Lomos had postulated, he could not even find a *family* effect (significant differences in performance within a single lineage). Dasen also referred to a recent study by three researchers of aboriginal children who had been foster or adoptive children in European families. They found that "the rate of cognitive development of these children was ... almost identical to the development found in middle class European children."[71] A further point was raised by Vetta who observed that while Jensen had mentioned that a large majority of aborigines had not "achieve[d] conservation in volume, area, and number," he did not report that a majority of part-aborigines had also failed to achieve conservation.[72] All in all, it would seem reasonable to reject the Jensen claim on aborigines.

Two studies in the United States utilizing "Piagetian" categories yielded findings considerably in conflict with the main run of conventional IQ studies.

Anastasiow proposed that the same cognitive process characterized white middle class and black inner-city children although their speech differed. Processes tested were differentiation, numeration, and seriation. Subjects consisted of 67 black inner-city children, 71 white rural children, and 60 white middle class children. They came from kindergarten, first, and second grades. The study revolved around the issue of whether language reconstruction by a child should be considered an error or a positive cognitive activity. By reconstruction, Anastasiow meant a process whereby one translates a given test word into his or her own vocabulary. Since the new word is formally not correct, usage of it is regarded as an error. Yet, the reconstructed word may well serve as a precise equivalent.

Five major findings were made by Anastasiow. First, he found that the black children reconstructed when they had an alternative word from their dialect. Second, most of the cognitive test errors were in fact reconstructions that served the purpose of the tests. Third, the black and white middle class children operated on a similar level in language, taking into account the reconstructions. Fourth, all three groups of children were unable to handle logic-type problems such as if-then. (Inability to handle these at the ages involved would be expected within the "Piagetian" schema.) Fifth, black children received higher scores than both white groups after receiving credit for the reconstructions. Reconstruction was, thus, not a signal of cognitive deficit; a number of high reconstructors scored high on overall cognitive functioning.[73]

Once more, then, social class and race determinism were misleading. Minority children were found to be quite capable indeed of holding their own.

A similar study was conducted by De Avila and Havassy. They wanted to know how minority children would score on mental ability tests if it were possible to control prior learning. According to the theory of IQ testing, prior learning should not play a role in a test inasmuch as the test presents unfamiliar material. After a period of pretraining–not discussed in detail by the researchers–Mexican American and Anglo children in New Mexico were given "neo-Piagetian" developmental tests as well as a conventional IQ test (Otis-Lennon Mental Abilities Test). The researchers found no ethnic group differences on the developmental tests. On the Otis, however, significant differences emerged, always in favor of the Anglo children. Since, as De Avila and Havassy note, the children tested came from a somewhat uniform social background, it is probable that developmental test differences would show up if Mexican American children from greatly differing social circumstances were tested.

The researchers conclude:

> The failure of Mexican American children to achieve in schools, to perform well on capacity and achievement measures must be attributed to reasons other than the alleged cognitive inability of the Mexican American child since our data show that there is no difference between Mexican [American] and Anglo-American children. Some of the reasons, we believe, lie in the standardized tests and curriculum which are used throughout the schools.[74]

To hold children responsible for these reasons, the researchers added, is to penalize them for circumstances not of their own making.

THE VARIETIES OF CHILDREN

One of the greatest educational handicaps which minority children bear is the burden of a label. Negro children are often described as though they were all of a kind, each suffering identical handicaps, all following a single path of development. This stereotype ill fits any group of children. It creates a special problem for the process of desegregation as parents and even some educators come to regard the minority children as uniformly poor academic achievers and antagonistic toward schools. Research does not support this misconception.

In 1930, Garth and colleagues tested 2,006 Negro children in Dallas and Tulsa and several other Oklahoma cities. At age 9.5 years, 48 percent of the Negro children overlapped the achievement scores of white children; 32 percent overlapped IQ scores of whites.[75] Over a period of time, the Negro-white gap widened.

The Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, Mo., is inhabited by many very poor Negro families. In a study at the project, Ladner found that school achievement was not highly valued there. Yet, she also reported: "...In those families where the economic stability was largely absent but where parents still found the inner strength necessary to provide their daughters with the incentive to hope for a better life, adaptation to a future orientation had been achieved ... I observed many stable family situations existing among a large number of households in which a female was the head."[76] In such families, schooling does play an important part.

In an interracial public housing project on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, Volkman found that few Negro parents were of the poorest group.[77] They took what appeared to be a disproportionately active part in school affairs through the Parent Teacher Association. On the other hand, in a study of the residents of a public housing project in Hunter's Point, San Francisco, there is an account of almost unrelieved antagonism between the school and the people.[78] By the eighth grade, Hippler reported a dropout rate of 25 percent.[79]

In two all-black kindergarten classes in Chicago, Ryckman studied the relationship between cognitive abilities and social class.[80] The subjects were 100 Negro middle and lower class boys. On tests of the major cognitive components, the middle class boys scored higher. With respect to general language ability scores, "only 20 percent of the middle class children obtained component scores below the medians of the lower class group and only 16 percent of the lower class children had scores above the middle class medians."[81]

Edna O. Meyers studied academic achievement among Negro boys in Harlem.[82] She analyzed two groups of 23 boys–achievers and underachievers. All were in the normal IQ range; the former, from somewhat more economically secure homes. Nevertheless, observed Meyers, "the lower class subjects"–who were achieving 2 years under norm–"...were concerned with academic achievement; they were depressed by experience of failure, and this reaction to school seems very like that held by motivated middle class school children."[83]

In Harrisburg, Pa., Franks compared successful and unsuccessful sixth grade Negro students.[84] All scored 90 IQ or more; there was no significant difference in IQ score between the groups. Yet, a full year and a half difference in mean achievement separated the two. While the parents were classed as "essentially laborers," the successful students seemed to come from a slightly higher economic level family; still there was no essential difference in parents' education.

Goldstein and associates studied school children in a predominantly Negro area of New Jersey. They found both successful and unsuccessful students but were unable to identify any characteristics that sharply distinguished between those two subcategories of generally disadvantaged youth.[85] "These young people," Goldstein and associates say, "are a far cry from the alienated products of disorganized homes...'[86] suggested by popular myth.

Fifth graders in 10 central Harlem schools were studied by Davidson and Greenberg to discover differences between high and low achievers.[87] Only 8 percent of 1,331 students tested scored above norm in reading and arithmetic. In the experimental group high achievers scored a reading test mean of 6.45 while the low achievers scored 2.85.[88] In comparing both groups on various psychological dimensions, Davidson and Greenberg found that high achievers were superior in convergent thinking abilities, had more positive attitudes towards school, and benefited from higher parental concern for their education. They conclude: "Rather than presenting a uniform picture of deficiency, our sample of Negro children from a severely deprived environment exhibited considerable variability."[89]

In a central North Carolina city, Harris equated the IQ scores of 591 Negro and 570 white fifth-graders.[80] All the scores were grouped into five levels: level I scored 70 and below; level II, 71 to 85; level III, 86 to 100; level IV, 101-115; and level V, 116 and higher. Mean IQ scores for Negroes was 91.6; for whites, 104.2. Then, a series of achievement tests was administered. Here is the distribution of achievement grade equivalents of children in the five IQ levels:[91]

I.Q. Level	Negro	White
I	3.7	3.6
II	3.9	4.4
III	4.4	4.9
IV	5.2	6.0
V	5.8	7.7

Note that for both racial groups, only the children on IQ levels IV and V achieved normal or higher grade placement. Part, at least, of the racial differences on those two levels probably can be explained by socioeconomic differences. (Harris did not control for this factor.)

At the Institute for Juvenile Research, Chicago, in mid-1965, two teams of researchers were investigating cognitive and achievement-related behavior among Negro children. Solomon and associates interviewed 72 sets of Negro parents of fifth grade children.[92] While all the families shared lower class status, they exhibited a variety of parental styles.

The Solomon team suspects that study of such factors will produce "better achievement than that which has been produced in studies using more global approaches."[93] Borowitz and Hirsch studied 32 4-year-old Negro boys living in a public housing project in the same general area of Chicago.[94] They succeeded in constructing a typology of cognitive potential in which three classes of cognitive differentiation are distinguished. On the basis of their intensive clinical study of the boys, they predict school achievement as follows:[95] Excellent, 9; Good, 10; Fair, 6; Poor, 7. No followup study has been published.

Entwisle and Greenberger found that Negro and white first graders in the Baltimore inner city were "more advanced linguistically than white suburban children ... in terms of paradigmatic responses..."[96] The reason, they surmised, was that the children learned verbal material from watching television. By third grade, however, the suburban children had higher scores on the word association test administered earlier. In Detroit, Sigel and Olmstead restudied a group of Head Start children 1 year after completion of a 1 month summer program. With respect to cognitive skills, the authors observe that "the considerable variability of these children indicate that they are not of the same cloth in spite of commonality in economic and social position."[97] Bereiter described his experience in teaching disadvantaged Negro children in an intensive project of compensatory education in the Champaign, Ill., area. He denied that any rote learning was going on, saying: "They are taught to figure these things out. And in so doing they display the verve, agility, and persistence that would ordinarily signal an IQ in the superior range."[98]

Mackler followed the entire school progress of a group of students attending a Harlem high school. His principal interest was in the effects of ability grouping. "...Initially," Mackler noted, "there are vast differences in the training children bring to school."[99] For better or worse, he reported: "...A ghetto school functions no differently from white middle class schools. Those who can do what is expected are rewarded and are encouraged to move ahead."[100]

Offenbacher studied children in four schools–Bayview and Market Street, lower class schools in New York City; Prospect Hill, a lower class school in Baltimore; and High Towers, a middle class private school in New York City. Among the lower class students she found a fundamental distinguishing characteristic to be the "ability to correctly perceive and respond to the requirements of their social world, and to evidence 'social competence' in interpersonal situations."[101] Schools, Offenbacher insists, should pay more attention to within-subculture differences than to between-culture differences. An emphasis on the former leads to an overconcern with 'cultural traits' that often strike the school as entirely unresistant. An emphasis on the latter, however, might lead to an understanding of specific factors that distinguish successful from unsuccessful students in the same milieu. Such factors may be more readily manipulable by the school and community.

In virtually each of the foregoing studies, the subjects attended segregated, inner-city schools. One may speculate on the even greater emergence of differences all along the ability range that might result from substantially improved education in a desegregated context.

Singh studied the creativity of 100 Negro and white first and sixth graders in Tampa, Fla. After controlling for socioeconomic status, he found relatively small differences between racial groups. On certain subtests he found significant differences favoring the more disadvantaged children. "The supposed inferiority on verbal tasks for low economic status," Singh found, "was not substantiated. Disadvantaged children seemed less inhibited and more of an explorer type."[102]

In Denver, Colo., Jackson studied the reasoning ability of 240 Negro and white ninth grade children in terms of Guilford's concepts of convergent and divergent thinking. Intelligence and socioeconomic status were controlled. While differences on all tests were statistically significant in favor of the white children, Jackson pointed out that the actual mean scores were not far apart. On tests of convergent thinking, respective mean scores for white and Negroes were 11.96 and 10.08; of divergent thinking, 23.82 and 21.23.[103]

ARE NEGRO CHILDREN A BLOC?

The notion of regarding all Negro children as identical in capacity and academic performance is inaccurate. There remains another, related belief–viz., that while Negro children may differ *among themselves*, they can be grouped together in relation to white children. Over many years, commonsense conclusions and research findings have accumulated in support of this belief. Only recently have contrary data started to enter the literature in force.

An often-repeated proposition is that Negro children are "motoric" and can learn better through means involving physical movement. Chief of these media is programed learning. A rare test was performed by Rodgers. He tested black school children in a geography classroom in Fayetteville, N.C., and concluded: "There is some evidence that pupils learn facts and concepts about longitude and latitude more effectively from a flexible method of presentation than from a programed method."[104]

In a rural area of northeastern Georgia, Richmond tested the creative thinking ability of 70 Negro and white segregated eighth graders. Test scores of whites exceeded those of Negroes in verbal and nonverbal intelligence. On creativity, however, results were mixed: "White students were superior on verbal fluency, verbal flexibility, figural flexibility, and figural originality. There were no significant differences between white and Negro on verbal originality and Negroes scored higher on figural elaboration."[105] Richmond speculates that the higher Negro score on figural elaboration involves "a high sensitivity in observation."[106] Asks Richmond: "Is it ... possible that their experiences have made them more sensitive observers of the human scene?"[107] Gitter and Black reported on an experiment in Boston: "Black perceivers were significantly better judges of emotion than their white counterparts."[108]

Tulkin sought ways to neutralize social class in a comparison of 389 Negro and white fifth and sixth graders in a suburban Maryland school system. He succeeded in part by taking into account more than socioeconomic status as measured by education and occupation of head of the household; he also included various aspects of the home environment, such as crowdedness, family intactness, and maternal employment. Viewing class in this comprehensive way, Tulkin found no achievement differences between upper socioeconomic whites and Negroes. [109] He has yet to "equate" social class between lower class Negroes and whites.

The obduracy of the problem of a statistical equivalence of Negro-white lower class is underscored by Kennedy. In 1965, he retested part of a sample of the Southeastern United States child population. These children were in segregated schools. In the period 1960-65, he found IQ had remained unchanged.[110] (In an earlier, preliminary report he had reported that IQ fell as the child grew older. In his later study, however, Kennedy explains that this finding was an artifact of sampling.)[111] Academic achievement continued to decline so that by the 10th grade, the average child lagged by 3 years.[112] Some four out of five of this group fall into the lowest socioeconomic level. "Thus," declares Kennedy, "when one speaks of the Negro child, he is talking about a socioeconomically deprived child who is Negro, and the relative weights of these two determinants cannot be isolated."[113]

LOOKING AND SEEING:

In 1969, the *Los Angeles Times* listed the average IQ scores for all elementary schools in the city. According to the article as printed, predominantly minority schools scored low while predominantly majority schools scored high. There was no mention of the fact that the school with the highest IQ score–Windsor Hills School–was 90 percent black. Spokespersons for the Windsor Hills community protested the omission. They stated that the school's IQ scores contradicted the contentions made earlier in the year by Professor Arthur Jensen that blacks were racially incapable of the type of intelligence tapped by conventional IQ tests. The newspaper later published a full-scale story on the achievement of the Windsor Hills children.

Meanwhile, Jensen was asked whether the Windsor Hills achievement contradicted his theory. Commenting on a newspaper article reporting the incident, Jensen wrote:

> The newspaper account adds that "most Windsor Hills students come from wealthy homes with parents who are doctors, lawyers, or professional people." Is it not likely that the children of these parents have inherited a better genetic endowment for intellectual development than the majority of children in the Watts ghetto? If so, you cannot argue that their higher IQ's are purely a result of the good environment provided by their affluent parents.[114]

Jensen's argument rested on his basic contention that social class position is inherited genetically. To support this argument, it would have to be shown that the black parents in question belonged to a long line of privileged families. Walker, who knew many of the parents personally, wrote that they were "first generation middle class, often from poor homes."[115] A detailed account of sustained efforts by the parents to maintain the level of education offered by the school as the neighborhood became black, though middle class, indicated that environmental factors were crucial.

It is perhaps unfair to expect newspapers to succeed where scholars fail. Yet, part responsibility for perpetuation of the myth of black failure lies in the hands of both. An unreadiness to recognize the reality of black achievement and a denigration of the achievement itself strengthen the deep racist tendency to regard blacks as inferior. At the same time, Windsor Hills merely announces that privileged children–even black ones–are more likely to succeed in the schools. It thereby also raises a question about the educational fate of children in not too distant Watts who lack nothing but privilege.

The operation of selective viewing was illustrated graphically in another case. In 1959, Dr. James Conant, chemist, former president of Harvard University, and diplomat published a study of the comprehensive high school in the United States.[116] This is a school that enrolls children of all estates and ambitions, preparing some for college, others for employment:

> ...A high school accommodating all the youth of a [single] community is typical of American public education... The comprehensive high school is characteristic of our society and ... it has come into being because of our economic history and our devotion to the ideals of equality of opportunity and equality of status.[117]

Conant and his staff personally visited some 55 schools in 18 populous States.[118]

Only 5 years later, Dr. Conant published another study of education.[119] In this work he dealt with the problem of segregated schools, a topic he had ignored in the earlier book. Indeed, he now treated his readers to a very rare experience in social science literature: He admitted he had been mistaken in a previous book:

> The comprehensive high school has been defended on social and political grounds as an instrument of democracy, a way of mitigating the social stratification of society. Such has always been my argument. But neither I nor anyone else, as far as I am aware, has underlined the fact that in the former Confederate States no comprehensive high schools have ever existed. When I undertook to study the comprehensive high school in 1957, I knew full well there were no truly comprehensive schools in a number of suothern States. I was tempted to exclude these States from my study and say frankly why. But I did not do so. I visited schools in States where at the most there has been only token integration since the Supreme Court decision. And I said not a word to indicate that certain schools I visited were comprehensive only in so far as white youth were concerned.[120]

This refreshing act of intellectual honesty went largely unnoticed, especially by those who shared Conant's fault but not his forthrightness.

Conant also observed that his silence about racial segregation and discrimination had been shared widely by professors of education as well as State and local school officials. Professional organizations, including regional accrediting associations, had helped suspend a sense of reality. In his second book, Conant not merely confessed error. He placed rectification of segregation near the center of his program for American education, noting that "so far neither the establishment nor the State educational administrative hierarchy has faced up to the problem of segregated schools."[121]

In both the Windsor Hills and Conant episodes, respected institutions and individuals failed to acknowledge the plainest realities of race and education. Inequality of opportunity was taken as the norm. This chapter as a whole has examined the norm and found that–despite its ancient lineage–its scientific supports are slipping away. Research concepts once universally accepted are found wanting. Sharply separating race from class and trivializing both, it had become possible to arrive at a justification of existing inequalities. By restricting "race" to skin hue, the concept was robbed of its broader and deeper political content. "Class" was reduced to a few material quantities that likewise omitted the political aspect of class control of community resources. The regime of inequality in the society and the culture was enforced effectively in the schools by an ideology of testing that converted an originally humane instrument into a die of indelible impression.

Contrary to the historic message of intelligence testing, studies examined in this chapter strongly support the positive potentialities of the school. In no meaningful sense was the school found to be a mere bystander. Through new testing approaches, means are available for much stronger affirmative instructional programs. A good deal of the fatalism inherited from earlier research is not an ineluctable consequence of the nature of the children whom many schools have failed.

SUMMARY

A system of penalty and privilege characterizes the U.S. public school. Educational research in the past acclimated itself to this relative apportionment. Theories and research approaches were generated that in one way or another lent support to the dominant exclusory forces in American education. This conception was jarred during the 1960's, especially, by rising movements for social and political equality. The same spirit began to affect social scientists and related researchers. A whole body of research started taking shape that rediscovered man's creative and resourceful possibilities, over and above the constrictions of socioeconomic position.

Inequalities of intelligence once equated with racial or class affiliation began to disappear in these new studies. Performance on the IQ test was found to express not genetic inheritance, but cultural and social opportunity. IQ disparities between white and black shrank sharply as researchers learned to take into account the children's mind-set during testing or the quality of the learning environment at home.

Whether ethnic minorities developed a distinctive cognitive style was a well-researched question. In the manner of educational and social science research, little effort was made to study groups of children in a natural setting of school or home. Instead, profiles and levels of test results were arranged to demonstrate the absence or presence of distinctive patterns. As noted earlier, the burden of such evidence was against the existence of patterns. Judging from the discriminatory administration of many aspects of special education, it was questionable whether poor and minority children could expect anything more constructive from instruction presumably tailored to "special" patterns of ability. Nearly 75 years have passed since the formal initiation of intellegence testing. Mass testing grew along with mass education. Few deny any longer the consequent loss of individual attention to single students. To be sure, the mass character of testing both reflected and stimulated the mass treatment of children in classrooms. Today, a growing disquietude hovers over the mass-tested and mass-taught schools of the western world.

Significantly, that doubt has begun to affect even some of the former leaders in the mass testing movement. In 1971, the British psychologist Cyril Burt, who had pioneered in statistical psychology, reiterated his faith in the intelligence test. In what turned out to be his last article, however, he unexpectedly warned his colleagues not to treat the child as a mere statistical unit:

> With human beings, when the problem is primarily psychological, statistical studies of populations should always be supplemented by case studies of individuals: early histories will often shed further light on the origin and development of this or that peculiarity. Tests should be supplemented by what Binet called the *methode clinique*, designed to verify the tacit assumption that they really do test what they are intended to assess. After all, each child is a complex and conscious organism, not a mere unit in a statistical sample.[122]

Burt thus affirmed the humanity of each child. In so doing, he tapped one of the deepest roots of contemporary educational concern. The extension of such concern to minority children remains a cardinal challenge to American education.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Frederick Douglass to William Lloyd Garrison, May 23, 1846, *Liberator*, June 26, 1846.

[2] See Kenneth J. Gergen, "Social Psychology as History", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26(1973) pp. 309-320.

[3] Dallas P. Dickinson, *"On Account He Ain't Had a Normal Home": An Intellectual History of the Concept of "Disadvantageness" in Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1973), p. 151.

[4] See Shib K. Mitra, "Mirror, Mirror ... A Brief Note on American Educational Research," *American Educational Research Journal*, 11(Winter 1974) pp. 41-49.

[5] In one degree or another, the following works exemplify some aspect of the characterization: James S. Coleman and others, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966); Christopher Jencks and others, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Basic Books, 1972); Arthur R. Jensen, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 39(1969) 1-123; and Daniel P. Moynihan and F. Mosteller (eds.), *On Equality of Educational Opportunity* (New York: Random House, 1972).

[6] E. Franklin Frazier, "The Present State of Knowledge Concerning Race Relations," *Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology*, II (London: International Sociological Association, 1959), p. 75.

[7] Brigham, *A Study of American Intelligence*, p. 191.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[9] Paul L. Nichols and V. Elving Anderson, "Intellectual Performance, Race, and Socioeconomic Status," *Social Biology*, 20(December 1973), pp. 367-374.

[10] Ralph Scott and James E. Smith, "Ethnic and Demographic Variables and Achievement Scores of Preschool Children," *Psychology in the Schools*, 9(1972) pp. 174-182.

[11] Edward Zigler, Willa D. Abelson, and Victoria Seitz, "Motivational Factors in the Performance of Economically Disadvantaged Children on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test," *Child Development*, 44(1973), p. 300.

[12] Wallace A. Kennedy, Vernon De Riet, and James C. White, *The Standardization of the 1960 Revision of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary-School Children in the Southeastern United States* (Tallahassee, Fla.: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961), p. 143.

[13] Ralph M. Dreger, "Intellectual Functioning," p. 221 in Kent S. Miller and Ralph M. Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States* (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).

[14] Leonard James McCullough, Sr., *A Study of the Predictive Efficiency of the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity, Level 2, For Negro and White Subjects* (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1969), pp. 53-54.

[15] Mona Faye Moorehead, *The Effects of School Integration on Intelligence Test Scores of Negro Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University. 1972), p. 20.

[16] Jerome M. Sattler, "Racial-Experimenter Effects," p. 12 in Miller and Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States.*

[17] James Edward Savage, Jr., *Testers' Influence on Children's Intellectual Performance* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971), p. 56.

[18] Norma Saxe Barnebey, *The Study of the Effect of the Race of Examiner on the Test Performance of Negro and White Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972), p. 74.

[19] Norman Solkoff, "Race of Experimenter as a Variable in Research with Children," *Developmental Psychology*, 7(1972), p. 72.

[20] Douglas F. Johnson and William L. Michael, "Performance of Blacks and Whites in Computerized versus Manual Testing Envionments," *American Psychologist*, (August 1973), p. 697.

[21] Sattler, "Racial-Experimenter Effects," p. 14.

[22] Irwin Katz, Calvin O. Atchison, Edgar G. Epps, and S. Oliver Roberts, "Race of Evaluator, Race of Norm, and Expectancy as Determinants of Black Performance," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 8(1972), p. 9.

[23] Patricia Jane Dyer, *Effects of Test Conditions on Negro-White Differences in Test Scores* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970), p. 107.

[24] Jane R. Mercer, *Labeling the Mentally Retarded. Clinical and Social System Perspectives on Mental Retardation* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1973), p. 191.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[26] Jane R. Mercer, "A Policy Statement on Assessment Procedures and the Rights of Children," *Harvard Educational Review*, 44(February 1974), p. 137.

[27] Jerry Adams, "Adaptive Behavior and Measured Intelligence in the Classification of Mental Retardation," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 78(July 1973), p. 80.

[28] Jerry Adams, Eranell I. McIntosh, and Barbara L. Weade, "Ethnic Background, Measured Intelligence, and Adaptive Behavior Scores in Mentally Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 78(July 1973), p. 4.

[29] John Howard Shannon, *An Analysis of Selected Sociological Variables Related to Special Class Placement Processes As a Function of Race* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 78.

[30] Frank Louis Bowles, *Sub-Test Score Changes Over Twenty Months on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children for White and Negro Special Education Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968), p. 72. Bowles notes that "subjects above 83 IQ on Pre-Test were emotionally and/or physically handicapped."

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[32] Gerald S. Lesser, Gordon Fifer, and Donald H. Clark, *Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[34] Susan S. Stodolsky and Gerald S. Lesser, "Learning Patterns in the Disadvantaged," *Harvard Educational Review* (1967), p. 587.

[35] David H. Feldman, "Problems in the Analysis of Patterns of Ability," *Child Development*, 44 (March 1973), p. 15.

[36] Gerald S. Lesser, "Problems in the Analysis of Patterns of Abilities: A Reply," *Child Development*, 44(1973), p. 19.

[37] Lawrence H. Stewart, Arthur A. Dole, and Yeuell Y. Harris, "Cultural Differences in Abilities During High School," *American Educational Research Journal*, 4(1967).

[38] *Ibid.*, p.27.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[40] Emmy E. Werner, Kenneth Simonian, and Ruth S. Smith, "Ethnic and Socioeconomic Status Differences in Abilities and Achievement Among Preschool and School-Age Children in Hawaii," *Journal of Social Psychology*. 75(1968).

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[42] D.B. Smith, *Report on Differences in Ethnic Learning Styles*, (1966) (ERIC # ED 015 253).

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[45] Emil George Sitkei, *Comparative Structure of Intellect in Middle and Lower-Class Four-Year-Old Children of Two Ethnic Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966) University Microfilms Order No. 67-5310.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[47] Donna Key Standley Burnes, *A Study of Relationship Between Measured Intelligence and Non-Intellective Factors for Children of Two Socioeconomic Groups and Races* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968), p. 63 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8989). See, also, Burnes, "Patterns of WISC Scores for Children of Two Socioeconomic Classes and Races," *Child Development*, 41(1970), pp. 493-499.

[48] S.H. Irvine and J.T. Sanders, "Logic, Language, and Method in Construct Identification Across Cultures," P. 430 in Lee J. Cronbach and P.J.D. Drenth (eds.) *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation* (The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1972).

[49] David H. Feldman, *The Fixed Sequence Hypothesis. Ethnic Differences in the Development of Spatial Reasoning* (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1969). p. 92.

[50] Mary Juhan Larsen and Jerry C. Allen, "Effects of Certain Subject Variables on Stanford-Binet Item Performance of Five-Year-Old Children," *Psychological Reports*, 26(1970), p. 981.

[51] Margaret Esther Backman, *Relationship of Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, and Sex to Patterns of Mental Abilities* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970), p. 71.

[52] Margaret Esther Backman, "Patterns of Mental Abilities: Ethnic, Socioeconomic, and Sex Differences," *American Educational Research Journal*, 9(Winter, 1972), p. 9.

[53] Larry Wendell Rivers, *The Stability of Differential Patterns of Mental Abilities in Children from Different Ethnic Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1970), p. 60.

[54] Charles Alphonso Stokes, *Some Effects of Schooling, Age, Race, and Socio-Economic Status on the Cognitive Development of Primary School Boys* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970), pp. 84 and 87.

[55] Max Donald Miller, *Patterns of Relationships of Fluid and Crystallized Mental Abilities to Achievement in Different Ethnic Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1972), p. 60.

[56] Elizabeth Waldkoetter Reiss, *The Influence of Race and Social Class Upon the Measurement of Intelligence, Cognitive Style, and Direct Learning Ability* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972), p. 73.

[57] Anna Leifer, *Ethnic Patterns in Cognitive Tasks* (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1972), p. 109.

[58] Anna Leifer, "Ethnic Patterns in Cognitive Tasks," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 7(1972), p. 73.

[59] Ronald L. Flaugher and Donald A. Rock, "Patterns of Ability Factors Among Four Ethnic Groups," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 7(1972), p. 28.

[60] Kevin Marjoribanks, "Ethnic and Environmental Influences on Mental Abilities," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(September 1972), p. 335.

[61] Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966, orig. 1934), p. 329.

[62] Sherwood L. Washburn in Melvin M. Tumin (ed.), *Race and Intelligence. A Scientific Evaluation* (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963), p. 25.

[63] Cronbach and Drenth (eds.), *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation*, p. 485.

[64] Reuven Feuerstein, in *Ibid.*, p. 268.

[65] Vidkunn Coucheron Thrane, in *ibid.*, p. 306.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 485.

[67] David Elkind in Jean Piaget, *Six Psychological Studies* (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), p. vi.

[68] See, for example, Arthur Jensen, "Race Put-Down," *New Society*, February 24, 1972, p. 410: "...In recent research by Professor Read Tuddenham, these Piagetian tasks reveal social class and racial differences in mental development of comparable magnitude to those found on Stanford-Binet IQ and other intelligence tests." No specific reference was given by Jensen.

[69] Jensen, "How Much Can we Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" p.

[70] Pierre R. Dasen, "The Development of Conservation in Aboriginal Children. A Replication Study," *International Journal of Psychology*, 7(1972), p. 79.

[71] Reference is to Pierre R. Dasen, P.R. deLacey, and G.N. Seagrim, "An Investigation of Reasoning Ability in Adopted and Fostered Aboriginal Children," in G.E. Kearney, P.R. deLacey, and Davidson (eds.), *The Psychology of Aboriginal Australians* (New York: Wiley, 1974).

[72] Stam Vetta, "Conservation in Aboriginal Children and 'Genetic Hypothesis'," *International Journal of Psychology*, 7(1972), p. 251.

[73] Nicholas J. Anastasiow, *Language Reconstruction Patterns of Kindergarten, First and Second Graders as Indicators of the Development of Cognitive Processes: A Study Exploring the Difference-Deficit Explanations of Language Behavior* (Bloomington, Ind.,: Institute for Child Study, Indiana University, n.d.), p. 33. See, also, Dolores G. Norton, *Environment and Cognitive Development: A Comparative Study of Socio-economic Status and Race* (Doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1969), p. 180.

[74] Edward A. DeAvila and Barbara B. Havassy, "A Piagetian Approach to IQ: A Mexican-American Study," 1974, unpublished paper.

[75] Thomas R. Garth, Bert E. Lovelady, and Hale W. Smith, "The Intelligence and Achievement of Southern Negro Children," *School and Society*, 32(1930), p. 432.

[76] Joyce Ann Ladner, *On Becoming a Woman in the Ghetto: Modes of Alienation* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968), pp. 168, 198. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 190).

[77] Jacob Volkman, *The Informal Social Environment in a Public Housing Development: A Survey of the Social Behavior, the Attitudes, and the Feelings of Project Tenants Toward the Project and Its Population* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1966). (University Microfilms Order No. 67-127).

[78] Arthur Edwin Hippler, *Family Structure and Social Structure: Matrifocality in Hunter's Point* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968),

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 90.

[80] David B. Ryckman, *Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12, 417) and "A Comparison of Information Processing Abilities of Middle and Lower Class Negro Kindergarten Boys," *Exceptional Children*, 33(1966-1967) 545-552.

[81] Ryckman, *Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children*, p. 59

[82] Edna O. Meyers, *Self-Concept, Family Structure and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966). (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5540)

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 64 (emphasis in original).

[84] Bonita B. Franks, *Some Social Determinants of Academic Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children* (University Microfilms Order No. 68-8688)

[85] Bernard Goldstein, Harry C. Bredemeier, William M. Phillips, Jr. and Coralie Farlee, *Social and Cultural Factors Related to School Achievement*, June 1967, p. IV-1. (ERIC ED 014 763)

[86] *Ibid.*

[87] Helen H. Davidson and Judith W. Greenberg, *Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background*, May, 1967. (ERIC ED 013 849)

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[89] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

[90] Gary Reeves Harris, *A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability is Held Constant* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967). (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6783)

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[92] Daniel Solomon Robert J. Parelius, and Thomas V. Busse, *Dimensions of Achievement-Related Behavior Among Lower-Class Negro Parents* (ERIC ED 021 904)

[93] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[94] Gene H. Borowitz and Jay G. Hirsch, *A Development Typology of Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds* (Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, March 21, 1968).

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[96] Doris R. Entwisle and Ellen Greenberger, *Differences in the Language of Negro and White Grade School Children 1*, 2(May 1968), p. 1. (ERIC ED 029 676)

[97] Irving E. Sigel and Patrica Olmsted, *Modification of Cognitive Skills among Lower-Class Negro Children: A Follow-Up Training Study*, August 1968, p. 32.

[98] Carl Bereiter, "A Nonpsychological Approach to Early Compensatory Education," in *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development* ed. by Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 344.

[99] Bernard Mackler, "Grouping in the Ghetto," *Education and Urban Society*, 2(1969). p. 84.

[100] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[101] *Deborah I. Offenbacher, Cultures in Conflict. Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower-Class Students*, (January 1969), p. 92.

[102] Surendra Pratap Singh, *A Comparison Between Privileged Negroes, Underprivileged Negroes, Privileged Whites, and Underprivileged White Children on a Test of Creativity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1967), p. 69. (University Microlfilms Order No. 68-232)

[103] Anne Mae Jackson, *Differential Characteristics of Reasoning Ability in Negroes and Whites* (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1967), p. 54. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2604)

[104] Frederick A. Rodgers, "Gain in Programmed and Flexible Presentations," *Elementary School Journal*, 68(1967-1968), p. 321.

[105] Bert O. Richmond, *Creative and Cognitive Abilities of White and Negro Children*, 1968, p. 4. (ERIC ED 030 922)

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[108] A. George Gitter and Harvey Black, *Expression and Perception of Emotion: Race and Sex*, May, 1968, p. 34. (ERIC ED 039 313)

[109] Steven R. Tulkin, "Race, Class, Family and School Achievement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9(1968), p. 35.

[110] Wallace A. Kennedy, *A Follow-up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 18.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[113] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[114] Arthur R. Jensen, "What Jensen Would Say," *Phi Delta Kappan*, (April 1970), p. 458.

[115] Olive Walker, "The Windsor Hills School Story," *Integrated Education*, 8(May-June 1970), p. 9.

[116] James Bryant Conant, *The American High School Today* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[119] James Bryant Conant, *Shaping Educational Policy* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[120] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

[121] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[122] Cyril Burt, "Inheritance of General Intelligence," *American Psychologist*, 27(March 1972), p. 189.

CHAPTER 5
LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM

Minority children experience more or less the same learning problems as other children. In addition, they face the imposed handicap of widespread beliefs among educators in their incapacity to achieve in school. As shown in chapter 3, there is no genetic evidence to demonstrate any such racial inferiority. Nor, as was indicated in chapter 4, can it be held that socioeconomic differences predetermine that minority children will fail in school. Racial and socioeconomic interpretations have been superseded somewhat recently by cultural interpretations. Minority children are said to be unfitted for school achievement because they are culturally deprived, disadvantaged, or different. One is reminded, however, of Seda Bonilla's observation:

> It often occurs that people substitute the word that refers to an idea without changing the idea. The word *culture* has been often substituted for the word *race* in the minds of some people, but it hasn't changed their thinking about race. In other words, culture has become a different word for the concept of race.[1]

Thus, theories of inevitable school failure by minority children turn out to be racial in conception if not in presentation.

In one form or another, the racial trend remains predominant in psychological and educational analyses of school achievement. Since 1965, more researchers are subjecting this interpretation to laboratory and empirical tests. The result is a clear—and welcome—finding that black and other minority children are fully capable of conceptual and other school learning, as thousands of teachers have long known from their experiences with minority students. Kagan reminds us, "... the majority of black children in America do master these school skills, as do the children of their great-grandfathers who attend schools in the new African nations." [2]

LEARNING PROFICIENCY STUDIES

For several years, Rohwer and his associates in the Institute of Human Learning at the University of California, Berkeley, studied the impact of race and socioeconomic factors on basic learning ability. In one project, they sought to determine whether poor school performance of poor black children was due to lesser learning proficiency. Three types of tests were administered to low socioeconomic blacks and high socioeconomic white children. Two were standard IQ tests, the Raven and the Peabody, and one was a paired associates test. The black children scored lower than whites on the IQ tests but not on the other test. As Rohwer and associates noted, only the paired associates test involved new learning while the IQ tests involved prior learning. In terms of "imaginative conceptual processes," the black group could be considered equivalent to the whites. The researchers also wrote of the "truly remarkable amount of variance in the success of original learning, for both populations, . . .associated with . . .the manner in which the learning materials are presented."[3]

In another study, Green and Rohwer selected 60 black children to study the effect of socioeconomic differences on intellectual functions. While the group as a whole had a narrow range of socioeconomic status, three subgroups were delineated. On a conventional reading test (Scholastic Aptitude Test—SAT) the highest socioeconomic level children scored considerably higher than the two lower groups. On digit span and paired associates tests, varying results were obtained. On the former, the lowest socioeconomic level children scored very low. On the latter, all three scored comparably. The researchers warn that the study indicates the lack of clear evidence to support models of learning proficiency that assign a critical role to socioeconomic factors.[4]

Kee and Rohwer compared the basic learning ability of 160 secondgraders in San Francisco. They were of black, white, Spanish American, and Chinese American backgrounds. All were of low socioeconomic level. A paired associates task was administered in two modes: verbal recall and pictorial recognition. No significant differences emerged. "The learning proficiency of children from different ethnic backgrounds," concluded Kee and Rohwer, "should be considered equivalent."[5] Scores were improved for all children when they were given an opportunity to practice. Kee wrote that "the successful improvement of learning observed for each ethnic group with particular verbal and pictorial presentation methods suggests that numerous avenues are available in facilitating children's learning."[6]

Rohwer stresses that while opportunity to learn varies greatly by social class and ethnic group, "by the time lower class Negro children reach first grade, they can learn nearly as proficiently as upper middle class white children."[7] IQ differences, according to Rohwer, have little necessary bearing on learning performance. They are no bars to the acquisition of new learning. To Rohwer, the evidence in his studies contradicts the Jensen model of two varieties of intelligence–type I (memory and rote learning) and type II (conceptual learning with an ability to handle abstract ideas)–only the simpler manifested among poor and black children. (See chapter 3, pp. 29-30.) Why, then, do so many black children fail to learn up to their proficiency? Rohwer replies that poorer black children starting out in school have "less developed learning tactics" than better off white children. In addition, their skills for presenting certain types of information are unevenly developed. He supposed, too, some skills necessary for classroom learning were inadequately mastered. Rohwer suggested that "a major objective of curricula in the early types of schooling, especially for low Socio-Economic Status (SES) Negro children, should be to assist them in mastering elaborative learning skills, i.e., to actualize children's capacity for imaginative conceptual activity, through concrete, explicit, and specific instructional programs."[8]

AN INTERNATIONAL VIEW

During the 1960's and early 1970's, the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) conducted a study of academic achievement in a number of countries.[9] While the study did not mention minorities, it was centrally concerned with the influence of the school on learning. Since, discussion of education of minority children in the United States so often founders on the argument that schools are necessarily ineffectual in changing the depressive impact of poverty and racism, it is appropriate to ascertain whether the active role of the school emerges in other countries.

From country to country, social and economic factors seemed very closely related to school achievement. The precise importance, however, varied among countries. Achievement in subjects which are heavily dependent upon school instruction, such as mathematics, showed only weak correlation with social class and home background. This was less true of reading, which is not so dependent on formal school instruction. Effectiveness of schooling was not measured, as it is so often in the United States, by average levels of achievement scores. Rather, the researchers wanted to know how well a school succeeded with the particular students attending that school. For each school a "handicap" score was calculated based on father's occupation, parental education, use of dictionary, number of books in home, and size of family.[10]

Coleman, in reviewing the IEA results, came to two important conclusions about schools and academic achievement. First, he found that while home background in all but one case outstripped the direct effect of schools, the strength of this relationship varied with subject matter: "Not all subjects are alike in the mix of family influences and school influences that determines their achievement."[11] Reading achievement, which is the most frequently used measure of academic gain is more dependent on home influences than science or literature. Thus, to use reading rather than science or literature, as a measure of achievement is automatically to understate school effects.

Second, Coleman found that in England home background explained a higher proportion of achievement score differences than in five other countries. For whatever reason, therefore, country-by-country variations have to be taken into account by researchers.

A distinctive factor studied by IEA was the degree to which students had an opportunity to study the material included in the achievement tests. At first glance, such a precaution would seem to be elementary. An achievement test has been defined as "a standardized, nationally normed final examination for a specified segment of school curriculum."[12] Teachers in the IEA study were asked to indicate the extent to which they had taught specific subject matter. Then, an analysis was made to ascertain the relation of achievement scores to opportunity to learn. The relationship was found to be close. As Bloom observes: "Perhaps the most important variable in accounting for the differences between national [educational] systems–even where they are equally selective–is the opportunity to learn as judged by teachers."[13] Bloom reports also that the IEA studies show "a significant relationship between the amount of time the student devotes to a subject and learning in that subject."[14]

ACHIEVEMENT STUDIES IN THE U.S.

In the United States, studies of academic achievement tend to follow the lead of the Coleman Report of 1966. This well-known research placed by far the greatest emphasis on the role of social class and peer group social composition in determining academic achievement. In explaining variations in achievement test scores, Coleman held that the autonomous contribution of the school was exceedingly minimal. Several restudies of the Coleman work arrived at similar conclusions. That of Jencks, in 1972, made this near absent role of the school a central concept of his analysis. In 1973, Mayeske and his colleagues completed their large-scale further analysis of the Coleman data.

According to Mayeske, achievement differences among students were ascribable, as follows: 10 percent to the contribution of the school, 48 percent to family background, and 42 percent to a combination of family background and school factors.[15] School factors were more significant for achievement in the case of black, Mexican American, American Indian, and Puerto Rican students than for whites and Asians. In the South the autonomous importance of schools was greater than elsewhere. As between the effect on achievement of fellow students or teachers, the former was found to be more important. However, it was not the social composition so much as the achievement-motivation of fellow students that was of greater importance. A student body consisting mainly of economically poor students is not harmful to the school's achievement. Rather, it is the achievement motivation of the student body that counts.

The importance of race and ethnic factors in achievement was measured by Mayeske in several ways. After equating students on socioeconomic status, the percent of achievement differences still explained by race ran from 7.5 to 10.9, depending on the school grade. Without controlling for socioeconomic status, race accounts for from 20 to 24 percent of achievement differences. Since Mayeske was using 1965 school data, the South comes through as the most segregated section. This is reflected in his finding that family background, especially as constrained through race and socioeconomic position, was most important for the South as allocator of students. By 1972, the South had become the least segregated area. How this change has affected the learning climate in southern schools is not treated by Mayeske. (Other research relevant to this issue is discussed in the next chapter.)

At each turn, the schools afford the poor and minority child a difficult reception. Mayeske writes:

> . . .The schools reflect a deep-seated social problem that permeates almost every aspect of our society. This problem, in the main, is that a child's birth into a particular stratum of our social structure largely determines where he will and will not end up in the scheme of things.[16]

This frank, though melancholy, observation implies that a basic improvement in academic achievement depends upon solution of a fundamental social problem.

A less somber analysis of achievement effects of schools was made by Winkler. This study goes beyond many of its predecessors in its findings regarding black and white achievement. Winkler studied the effect of schooling both at one point in time and over a relatively long period. The achievement gap between black and white students was viewed as resulting from a cumulative process of experiences. Winkler regarded the school environment as consisting of the composition of the school peer group and the school inputs (such as teachers, grouping practices, and others). His sample consisted of 388 black and 385 white students in urban secondary schools.

". . . Compared to whites," Winkler writes, "blacks perform less well after 8 years of schooling than they did upon entering school." He adds that "it is difficult to believe that the schools may not share some responsibility for this phenomenon . . ."[17] Over their school careers, Winkler holds, black and white students do not experience equal school environments, even when they are schoolmates. The school's resources are differentially "productive", in learning, as between the races. Just how much of the resources a student gets depends in good measure on his race and his track within the school. Winkler found that black achievement rates varied more by track than when compared with rates of white students; the track effect was larger than the race effect. At the same time, the race effect was, in part, also a factor in tracking. Few blacks were in the college track; many were in the general track.

Thus, the white-black achievement gap is sharply differentiated by track. Winkler found that "the achievement gap between blacks and whites appears to decline as one goes from vocational to business to college track."[18] An additional factor measured by Winkler, and found related to achievement differences, was the difference or similarity between racial composition of the elementary and the junior high school attended. This novel measure revealed that both black and white college track students tended to experience less of an abrupt change in transition since they more often came from a predominantly white elementary to a less white junior high school. Black and white students in the noncollege tracks, on the other hand, experience a more abrupt transition as they come from "whiter" elementary schools and enter "blacker" junior highs.

Among the specific school inputs that were significantly related to achievement differences was the quality of teacher element. In this context, "quality" covered whether teachers had been graduated from prestigious colleges, the amount of their postgraduate credit, their salary level, the extent of their experience, and –as teachers–their attitudes toward minority students. Winkler warns that the teacher effect on achievement may have been overestimated in previous studies. As he explains, "teachers who have the most experience, the highest salary, the highest academic qualifications tend to choose to teach the best students."[19] Consequently, the high achievement of these students may result from a choice by the teacher rather than because of anything that happens in the process of instruction. (While Winkler does not raise the possibility, his observation could also apply obversely. That is, *less* qualified teachers might choose to teach low achievers, the more readily to avoid the embarrassment of their own inadequacy. In that event, a low teacher effect would also be spurious - i.e., it would reflect an act of teacher selection rather than the incapacity or the failure of children to learn. Possibly, a more adequate teacher could lead the same children to greater achievement. What, for example, would ensue if Winkler's best qualified teachers were to teach the lowest achieving children?)

Winkler arrived at a quantitative estimate of the relative importance of various resources in accounting for black-white achievement differences within each track. The following listing indicates his findings (expressed in percents):

Achievement Resources	Vocational track	Business track	College track
IQ	12.6	11.6	6.8
Home Environment	14.5	14.8	0.0
School Environment	36.2	27.3	63.7
Total, 3 Resources	63.3	53.7	70.5

Clearly, in each track the dominant factor in black-white achievement differences is school environment. In the college track, this single factor dominates the scene. In the business track, however, it barely exceeds in importance the combined force of IQ and home environment.

Other than teacher quality, Winkler pointed to racial and social composition of student peer group as critical. Black students seemed to suffer an achievement disadvantage because of sharp changes in racial composition and cultural milieu from elementary to junior high school. This would suggest that integration might well be moderated in his or her interest. At the same time, however, Winkler found that black sixth graders suffered a learning disadvantage as the proportion of classmates of lower socioeconomic status rose. Thus, he concluded, integration by social class seemed appropriate. Since so few middle class blacks were available, social integration required racial integration. Children of higher socioeconomic status were more plentiful among whites.

The Winkler study is important for its measurement of achievement over a long time period, for its linking of achievement and internal track organization of the school, and for its clear delineation of the role of race in achievement. The practical applications of the study are also significant inasmuch as they are shown to flow from the educational findings. In a work other than that reviewed earlier, the Mayeske group also concluded that measures to create more heterogeneous student bodies would tend to increase achievement and the effect of the school.[20]

Several other recent survey type studies have concluded that the school makes a significant contribution to academic achievement. Guthrie and colleagues, based primarily on a study in Michigan, held that "relatively inadequate [school] services lead to lower levels of academic achievement."[21] In a study of 1,061 third graders in a large California school system, Hanushek found that student achievement gains were closely related to better teachers–defined as teachers who had recently been involved in gaining additional training. Experience and advanced degrees as such, he found, had little effect on achievement. With respect to 140 Mexican American students in his sample, Hanushek reported the "shocking" finding that "it was impossible to find any discernible impact of schools . . ."[22] He attributed this to the failure of the schools to take the bilinguality of the children into account.

SOCIAL CLASS AND ITS MECHANISMS

If there is one overarching theme in achievement research it is that social class or, more narrowly, socioeconomic status, is the dominant determinant of school achievement. Yet, more and more researchers are perplexed by the difficulties in tracing the precise paths whereby social class affects achievement. Michelson writes: "There is simply no reason to believe, from the correlation between social class and academic success, either by school means or by individuals that the cause of this association is the home life of the children."[23] He adds in explanation that "no direct *statistical inference* of this nature can be made."[24] Miller calls social class "a crude variable of limited direct importance in the problem of school achievement . . ." and recommends that it receive less attention in future studies.[25] Social class, or its shorthand equivalent–the home–is everywhere and no place. It is said to have an effect but few of its concrete manifestations are traceable. Yet, to deny the role of social class in a class society would be a greater mistake.

The principal mediating mechanisms of social class operate to allocate educational opportunities unequally and in a racist manner. (See the discussion of penalty and privilege, chapter 4, pp. 1-2.) Some of them are (1) school climates, (2) school grouping practices, and (3) communitywide power disparities.

SCHOOL CLIMATES

Clark has written that "massive academic retardation is accepted as the norm for minority group children . . . "[26] This charge has seldom been subjected to test by research. Understandably, school authorities have rejected it out of hand. While the very broadness of the charge complicates any adequate evaluation, yet a review of several school climate studies may clarify certain aspects of the issue.

Henderson studied 16 schools in Michigan during 1970-71; each was at least 70 percent white or black. His primary interest was in school climate which he defined as "the interactions of principal, teachers, and students within the school that produce an atmosphere that will enhance or mitigate against academic performance."[27] Henderson matched as nearly as possible pairs of black and white schools with comparable socioeconomic levels and differing achievement scores. The strongest contrast he found was in the way teachers typically oriented themselves toward students. In predominantly black schools, teachers practiced what Henderson calls "creaming off and cooling out." Emphasizing competition among individual students, teachers selected students most approximating middle class standards and tracked them for academic success. Probable failure awaited the remainder. In predominantly white schools, on the other hand, teachers tended to stress cooperation, and the cooling out of less able students was less marked. Self-concept of black students in the segregated black contexts was high. Henderson suggests, however, that this reflected the student's feeling that he could easily achieve at the relatively low level expected of him. "A disheartening implication" of the study, commented Henderson, "is the seemingly systematic manner in which black schools are providing a substandard education for their constituents."[28]

A companion study to Henderson's was done by Schneider soon afterwards. He selected 24 elementary schools; in all of them, student bodies were at least 70 percent black or white. Schneider found a sense of futility among the students to be "by far the most important climate variable within our sample of schools . . ."[29] This was true even when socioeconomic status, race, and type of community were controlled. The degree to which teachers perceived that a student was likely to continue into college also related closely with his or her academic achievement. Some factors were differentially significant, depending on race. Thus, whether or not a teacher perceived a student as capable of academic improvement was important for black urban schools but not elsewhere. Schneider concluded that justifying students' low achievement on the ground of race or socioeconomic status was incompatible with his findings. "An environment in which all members of the school social system . . . perceive present and future academic achievement as a realistic goal," according to Schneider, "appears to have a strong relationship with achievement."[30]

Brookover and colleagues have generalized the findings of the two previous studies as well as others along the same line. While somewhat lengthy, the following quotation summarizes well the findings of the Michigan State University group of researchers:

> . . .A combination of three student and three teacher factors accounts for most of the differences in achievement between students in these schools. The first of these is the factor which we call the student's sense of futility. This includes the student's sense of control within the school's social environment and his perception of whether or not the teachers care or are committed to his achievement. The two expectation-evaluation-self-concept factors are oriented toward the present situation and the other [the future] also accounts for a considerable proportion of the variance in achievement. The parallel factors in the teacher complex also account for some of the differences. The student's sense of futility, the teacher's belief in the improvability of the student, and the two sets of present and future expectations and evaluation factors consistently distinguish between the high and low achievement schools. The teacher's belief in the improvability is particularly relevant in black schools. The school climates of black schools are distinguished from the white schools by sense of control and the level of expectations and evaluations.[31]

The researchers note that changing the social composition of student bodies–through, say, desegregation–will be effectual only if the crucial social-psychological variables also change.

Meyers studied a highly selected sample of 327 Negro students attending 15 predominantly white high schools throughout the country. Altogether, the Negro students made up 2.2 percent of enrollment. School climate, Meyers found, was significantly related to educational aspirations and achievement for both Negro and white students, but less so for the former.[32] The Negro student is *in* the school but not completely a part *of* it. As Meyers states: ". . . Racial integration is a necessary but not sufficient condition for social integration of a minority group . . . It is quite possible that the Negro youth who stars in a football game may be excluded from the victory celebration that night . . ."[33] Yet, the Negro student's self-esteem remains high in these very same schools. Esteem has meaning only as a comparative concept: one feels *as* good or better *than* or less *than*. With whom is the Negro student comparing himself?

Meyers replies: "Given the white educational setting, Negro self-esteem is based upon blackness."[34] Though surrounded by whites, he maintains his black identity by referring his sense of self-awareness to his Negro roots. This somewhat puzzling feat is made more intelligible when we examine the Negro student's actual patterns of social interaction in the tokenly desegregated schools. Meyers found "the existence of subsocieties . . .*delimited by racial identity* within the social system of the high school."[35] The Negro student and his Negro peers are thrown together with the result that they act to reinforce each other's already high aspirations. For these Negro students, peer influence is more important than climate effect; the reverse is the case for white students in that same school.

It should be noted that Meyers was studying situations in which no more than token desegregation existed whereas the Michigan studies referred to very different student body compositions. With so few black students, little opportunity existed for the school to develop differential climates on the basis of race. In token schools, perhaps there is opportunity only to translate ethnicity into social groupings that are not relevant to achievement.

With reference to Clark's previously quoted charge that massive academic retardation is the acceptable norm for minority children, the evidence contained in formal studies is meager. Researchers have evaded the issue. On the other hand, the Michigan studies strongly affirm the charge.

SCHOOL GROUPING PRACTICES

In 1970, a civil rights organization asked an expert on testing for his advice on ability grouping and tracking. The expert warned: "Children put in 'slow' classes rarely catch up. Programs for 'slow learners' are slow-down programs in most cases and make catching up impossible."[36] A British educator matches this sentiment: "We are now beginning to learn that any form of educational provision which is regarded as appropriate for intellectually inferior children ends up by being inferior."[37] How does recent research bear on these views?

In 1973, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) completed the largest scale national study yet made of the effects of desegregation. Detailed discussion of it is reserved for the next chapter. At this point, however, it is appropriate to note the treatment of ability grouping and tracking in the NORC report. The analysis was restricted to 598 schools selected from 103 different southern school districts. Nearly all the schools had been involved in massive desegregation programs ordered by Federal courts during the 1971-72 school year. Focus of interest in grouping was not so much on achievement as on its effects upon white-black student interactions and attitudes.

In elementary schools, NORC found, black children grouped in remedial classes were stigmatized in the eyes of white children. This was the case even when achievement grouping was practiced within a single classroom. Ability grouping in elementary schools thus seemed to generate unfavorable white attitudes against desegregation.[38] Tracking in high schools, NORC reported, had different effects under specified conditions:

> . . . In high schools, where tracking is carried out in a nonauthoritarian way, and where the students and staff are relatively liberal, ability grouping, even if it leads to increased segregation of classes, may have slight positive effects on attitudes toward integration and other racial attitudes.[39]

Negative racial attitudes, on the other hand, resulted from tracking in those high schools "that were both rural and conservative in their approach to race relations."[40] One special factor working in favor of good racial relations in nonrural high schools was the fact that many of these schools used Federal grants to institute intergroup relations programs. NORC regards these programs as having been highly effective in helping increase academic achievement.

Evans and Galloway studied socioeconomic status and ability as factors in high school tracking. Their sample consisted of 9th- and 12th-graders in the Project TALENT study of 1960 and 1965. Three tracks were studied—college preparatory, general, and vocational. The researchers found that "the college preparatory program tends to enroll the high academic ability and the high socioeconomic environment students at the expense of the other programs . . ."[41] Because Project TALENT did not collect data by race in 1960, it is not possible to state the importance of race in the three tracks. There would be small reason to doubt that blacks tended to concentrate in the general and vocational tracks and whites in the college preparatory track. As Evans and Galloway observe, "on two key variables, socioeconomic status and verbal ability, the student populations of these programs are not at all the same."[42] The researchers did not reach the question of whether discrimination played a part in the distribution of students among the tracks. In an older study, Kariger did find that the higher the school socioeconomic status, the closer the match between the student's status and lane placement. Few teachers cared to teach students in the lowest lane. Discrepancies between measured ability and lane placement, Kariger found, "are significantly related to the socioeconomic status of the parents with the descent on the socioeconomic scale increasing the possibility that the pupil will be laned below his ability."[43]

Mackler studied the operation of ability grouping in a Harlem elementary school during 1963-66. In addition, he traced retrospectively the school careers of 300 students from first grade through high school. All were black. During the first year of the study, observers were placed in the elementary school so they could build up a day-to-day picture of ability grouping in practice. The study was nearly unique in this respect.

Mackler found grouping to be extremely rigid with an almost total absence of upward mobility. A few children assigned early in their careers to a high ability group occasionally moved down a notch or two. During a 3-year period of study in the elementary school, none of the children in average or lower groups entered the upper groups.[44] Children in the top group were able, compliant, and popular. "The less popular are among the less able," writes Mackler, "with the teacher-rejected pupils typically less able and isolated from their peers."[45] Since the best teachers tend to prefer working with the most able children, Mackler notes, "the more able students have 6 years of better teaching."[46] Even in a school where average achievement levels are extremely low as a result of grouping, relatively few students gain an advantage. Mackler holds that a close study of academic success in black schools casts great doubt on prevailing theories of cultural and social deprivation. "A theory of deprivation," he declares, "should be developed that is broad enough to explain why certain pupils succeed and other[s] do not, given the same social background."[47] An appreciable role in developing that theory should be accorded the factor of selective opportunities as influenced by school grouping policies.

Heyns studied tracking in 48 high schools drawn from the data collected in 1965 for the Coleman Report. The relationship of race and tracking was restricted to only 15 high schools, each of which had a black enrollment exceeding 10 percent. Assignment to a specific track, Heyns found, "is not racially discriminatory in the present sample of schools when verbal ability level is controlled."[48] She pointed to ability differences rather than deliberate school policy in explaining the within-school racial concentrations by track, with blacks heavily in the lower tracks.

In three all-black schools, Heyns found a large number of students in the college preparatory track despite their low verbal scores. (This was quite unlike the situation in the other 12 racially mixed schools.) Heyns wondered whether these black college preparatory students "actually receive college preparation equivalent to white students . . ." Her surmise was that "it seems reasonable to doubt that they do."[49] In support of her surmise, she found that race accounted for somewhat less than one-fourth of the difference in between-schools verbal ability scores.

With respect to tracking and socioeconomic factors, Heyns found—contrary to other researchers—that "stratification in schools seems to be determined by ability level rather than the social class background."[50] Nor did nonsegregated schools tend to favor more advantaged students. Access to counseling services was also found to be essentially unrelated to social class: ". . . Neither the social class nor racial background of the student predict the differential allocation of counselor's time or encouragement . . ."[51] All in all, Heyns found in the sampled high schools a strongly meritocratic structure of grouping, exhibiting few features of racial or social discrimination—a picture often drawn by spokesmen for school systems. Heyns reported no evidence to contradict it.

How does the Heyns study relate to others? Winkler, as previously noted, came up with opposite findings on the relation of race and track. While Heyns finds no relationship between race and track placement, Winkler reported the two to be closely interrelated. Heyns' study was a one-time affair, based on data gathered by Coleman in September 1965, while Winkler covered a long period and was able to take into account the cumulative effect of certain other factors. Heyns' hint of differential academic standards for placement in the college preparatory track, as exemplified by three all-black schools, finds strong agreement in the work of Henderson and Schneider on school climates. One might summarize the point of agreement by citing the conclusion of yet another study. Schafer and Olexa, in their study of high school tracking, concluded that evidence suggested "the operation of unofficial grade ceilings for noncollege preparatory students and grade floors for college-bound students."[52] Yet, Heyns rejects implicitly such a conclusion for her sample as a whole. In part, this view rests on a characteristic of her sample. Drawn from the Coleman report, it is lacking representation from very large school systems which refused to participate in that study—Chicago, Los Angeles, and a number of other large cities. Another possibly unrepresentative aspect of the Heyns sample was inclusion of a Washington, D.C. high school that was 88 percent white (in a school district overwhelmingly black, even in 1965) yet classified as "integrated."[53] The same was true of a high school in Philadelphia.

Most surprising, however, is not this or that conclusion of *any* of the tracking and grouping studies. Rather, the very small number of any studies on the subject is a matter of wonderment. The few studies reported establish the view that inquiries into academic achievement of poor and minority students may be significantly weakened without careful attention being paid to grouping. It is also clear that the greatest need is for careful on-the-spot studies of actual classrooms and schools.

COMMUNITYWIDE POWER DISPARITIES

Does the distribution of power in the community affect academic achievement of minority children? And if so, what channels are involved?

Ogbu studied a predominantly black and Mexican American neighborhood in Stockton, Calif. called Burgherside. This is a very poor 30 square-block area in which some 1,800 people live. The period of the study extended from September, 1968 to May, 1970. For the first 16 months, the researcher lived in the area and came to know the people well. He visited many homes, speaking with parents and children; he became a familiar figure in the area's schools. As a black Nigerian by birth and an anthropologist at the University of California, Berkeley, he was welcomed by Burgherside:

> From my own observation of black children and from my discussions with them and with teachers and parents, I think that these children do not take their schoolwork and their tests seriously; they do not, therefore, try to maximize their test scores, whether for IQ or scholastic achievement. These test scores simply do not represent the real potential of black children.[54]

But why don't they try? Essentially, Ogbu holds, because school failure to Burghersiders "is both a reaction and an adaptation to the limited opportunity available to them to benefit from their education."[55] The message from the outside community, as "read" by Burgherside parents, is: "Education does not really pay if one is black or Mexican American."[56] Daily documentation is plentiful as children listen to adult complaints of discrimination.

In the larger community of Stockton, dominant Anglo society has developed an ideology of inferiority to account for Burgherside failures in school. "The major function of the white belief system," writes Ogbu, "is to justify the low position of subordinate minorities in the socioeconomic structure of society by ensuring that subordinate minorities do poorly in school."[57] Teachers identify with this ideology. In elementary school, Burgherside children tend to get the same grade regardless of the volume of work done. Consequently, Ogbu holds, "by the time the children leave the elementary school they have not learned to associate a certain amount of work with a certain type of grade."[58]

School counselors cooperate in limiting the social mobility of Burgherside children: They "tend to 'program' the students into certain classes primarily on the basis of their previous performance rather than future plans."[59] A stringent ability grouping system tends to lock children into the lower ranks. In 1968, Burgherside's Black Unity Council demanded an end to tracking. As Ogbu reports, once the changes were made, it was found that "those students who normally should be in the 'low ability groups' did not fail their courses in the classes for 'high ability groups.'"[60] In fact, during the 1969-1970 school year, the senior high school offered five instead of only two courses in chemistry; and, in contrast to the year earlier, black and Mexican students were registered in these courses. In 1968-69, neither black nor Mexican students took the two courses.[61]

Burgherside children, Ogbu declares, will never basically improve their academic achievement until two conditions are fulfilled: (1) They must be afforded equal learning opportunities and (2) they must be able to enjoy equal benefits of education. Recent improvements in minority employment have raised somewhat the educational aspirations of the children but the change is minimal. Ogbu stresses that the problem of the children does not result from an intellectual deficit or a lack of family aspirations or from personality difficulties.

On a narrower scale, Turner studied the same order of problems, only this time in eight small rural communities in South Carolina. The 518 seventh and eighth graders attended completely segregated schools. Turner was concerned with achievement orientations and values, rather than academic achievement. He found a clear difference between the 195 black and 323 white students. On the basis of replies to a questionnaire, the following mean achievement scores were registered (with a possible range of 1 to 16):[62]

	Blacks	Whites
Achievement motivation	2.9	5.1
Achievement values	8.1	10.7

These orientations were quite realistic, given the occupational structure of the rural communities. As Turner reports, while nearly 9 out of 10 adult blacks are on the lowest rung of the occupational ladder, only about 2 out of 10 whites are that low. Subsistence farming and unskilled manual labor are just about the only *careers* open to black adolescents in these areas. The segregated schools they attend are not merely inferior places to learn; they symbolize "control of blacks" life fate by the dominant white power structure."[63] Turner concludes that among these young people, achievement orientations are much more dependent on perception of the actual distribution of opportunities than upon any training within the family.

Neither Ogbu nor Turner contends that the schools are *unable* to change the larger community patterns of subordination of minorities. They are stressing that the schools have become part of the social system whereby the subordination is enforced. Therefore, both view achievement, either academic or vocational, as powerfully influenced by the communitywide distribution of power—especially economic power.

The possible impact on achievement of two additional factors has gone almost unstudied. These are tangible resources on a school-by-school basis and actual time spent in classroom work.

TANGIBLE RESOURCES

As pointed out in chapters 1 and 2, the historic pattern of discrimination was planned deprivation along with deliberate segregation. Unfortunately, however, much legal and social science thought on schools has come to regard segregation *as* deprivation, while at the same time treating discrimination of tangible resources as merely secondary. This mode of thought was encouraged by the conscious pretense in applying the separate-but-equal doctrine of *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*. No realistic observer ever reported finding a segregated school system that was "equal" in terms of tangible resources.

Deprivation of tangible resources lay at the heart of educational discrimination. Franklin notes that school boards regularly reduced expenditures on black schools before doing the same in white schools.[64] Bond adds that cuts in school funds for white schools might eliminate extracurricular activities while similar cuts for black schools resulted "in the shortening of terms, the discharge of teachers, or the closing of schools . . ."[65] Systematic racial discrimination in the employment of tangible resources has continued into the very recent past. In Memphis, teachers in black schools were frequently forced to raise funds by selling lunchsnacks in the classroom. Fundraising quotas were established for teachers. A black principal in that city told a reporter: "Success or failure in meeting quotas may even have affected the evaluations that principals have to make of teacher performances."[66] A high official of the schools acknowledged that "until a few years ago, the problems in Negro schools were largely ignored."[67]

Change in the racial character of neighborhoods has a significant effect on tangible resources made available to minority children. This seems to be the case regardless of the social class—but not the race—of the newcomers.

In Detroit, Stark studied how resources were allocated to 164 schools during the period 1940-1960. Over these years, the percent black population over the city as a whole rose from 9.2 to 28.9 percent. Those neighborhoods experiencing the greatest influx of blacks suffered the sharpest drop in educational quality. Since teacher salaries made up some 80 percent of instructional cost, much of the drop in quality reflected changes in distribution of teachers. Many experienced white teachers during these years left the changing areas and were replaced by persons classified as Emergency Substitute Teaching Position (ESTP). This movement occurred within the framework of school board policy. At no time during 1940-1960 did the teachers union have a contract with the school board. Thus, the free transfer of experienced teachers resulted from the action of the school board and not from that of the teachers union.

During these years, observes Stark, "The stated aim of the Detroit Board of Education is one of equal expenditures per child. The data indicate that Detroit was not very successful in pursuing this objective."[68] Rather, more per child was spent in wealthier than poorer areas. Relative deterioration of expenditures in black areas thus helped finance higher expenditures in white middle class areas. The "no-fail" policy, according to Stark, "frees many of these resources to be used on high socioeconomic status children."[69] This is true because retaining a child doubles the cost of its schooling. (In Memphis, Vincent reports that retention of only 10 percent of the black children would add over $4 million dollars annually to school costs.)[70]

Stark also pointed out a little-noticed implication of student mobility. Since it is generally higher among poor and minority children, the relationship of school resources to achievement for these children reflects not only the school attended at any given time but also the totality of schools attended in the past. Researchers such as Coleman, however, attribute much of achievement variation in a school to family background. Stark holds that if one adds up the cumulative effects of all the schools attended by a single child, achievement will be viewed as less dependent on family background and more on the school's effects. The black child is therefore even more open to school influence than Coleman-type inquiries concede. Thus, concludes Stark:[71]

> . . . The conflict between equity and efficiency was resolved neither equitably nor efficiently. Detroit devoted fewest resources to the children who could benefit most from them.

The eclipse of social class by race is illustrated in the matter of the Windsor Hills school, discussed previously, p. 73. In that case, an upper middle class area changed its racial, but not its social, complexion. Black parents found they had to insist that school authorities not reduce the breadth of academic offerings as well as the span of extracurricular activities.[72] While no quantitative data are available, the example illustrates the educational risks of racial change.

Empirical studies of unequal resources within a single school system are by no means numerous. In 1970, a research team, advisory to a Federal Government agency, reported on inequalities in the distribution of experienced teachers in the Chicago public schools.[73] In the 1970-71 school year, Berk and Hartmann found the city schools were spending 9.2 percent more on instructional expenses for each white child than for black children. For teacher salaries only, the discrepancy rose to 10.9 percent.[74] In the same school year, Walberg and Bargen also studied the situation in Chicago. They found white schools were receiving significantly more per student both in terms of more educated and more experienced teachers. Academic achievement was associated with higher teacher quality. "It is disturbing," write the researchers in apparent agreement with Stark, "that minority groups get lower 'teacher quality', even though they are compensated with smaller class sizes, because minority children, particularly Negroes, appear to benefit more than whites from better teachers."[75]

Even fewer studies exist for New York City. Landers examined per student expenditures in 1970-71 for the city's 65 academic high schools. His findings are consistent with those in Detroit and Chicago;

> . . . The greater the reading retardation in a school, the higher the pupil-teacher ratio—i.e., the greater the number of pupils per teacher . . . The greater the reading retardation in a school, the smaller the percentage of teachers with more than 3 years experience.[76]

Overcrowding was found to be directly related to reading retardation. In the four lowest achieving high schools 59.4 percent of the students were 2 or more years behind norm in reading while in the four highest achieving high schools fewer than 1 percent were that far behind. Yet, the former schools were 42 percent over-utilized; the latter, 5 percent underutilized.[77] Landers, an assistant superintendent in the New York City system, recalled the school board's pledge in 1958 that it favored "the quantitative and qualitative reassignment of school personnel, in terms of the proportionate needs of the school populations involved . . ."[78]

Virtually every study yet made on per student share of teacher costs has depended on citywide data provided by the school board. These data do not reflect actual expenditures but merely budgeted amounts which are nothing but authorizations to spend. It is likelier that budget figures understate inequalities rather than the reverse.

Teacher salary figures—as baselines—do not permit the outsider to distinguish between salary and fringe benefits. Landers has explained the potential impact of fringe benefits on inequality of expenditure:

> A beginning substitute teacher costs $6,200 plus 7 percent in fringe benefits for a total cost of $6,634. A teacher on maximum (salary) costs $12,000 plus 30 percent in fringe benefits for a total cost of $16,380 . . . This fact would be unimportant if teachers at different levels of service, licensing, and educational preparation were distributed equally among the schools. . . The fact is that these levels are unequally distributed throughout the school system. It is a matter of common knowledge . . . that the schools for poor children have fewer experienced teachers and more substitutes.[79]

Suppose one school were staffed entirely with substitutes at beginning pay, and another with teachers at maximum step on the salary schedule; assume the two schools employed 35 teachers and served 1,000 students each. Total teacher costs in the first school would be $232,190 or $232.19 per pupil; in the second school, teacher costs would be $573,330 or $573.33 per pupil. While few, if any, schools in reality duplicate these figures, a number do approximate them. Interestingly, Landers states that—to the best of his knowledge—no study of actual staff costs has been made in New York City. In the absence of such research, an unacknowledged cloud of unreality envelops discussion and study of inequality of educational opportunity. Widespread failure by researchers to undertake detailed school-by-school studies has resulted in false impressions as to the allocation of resources within school systems.[80] Some of these shortcomings have been overcome by various studies.[81]

Much of what is known of the impact of the teacher on student achievement consists of statistical deduction based on an exceedingly narrow range of considerations. Direct measurement of empirical materials awaits further development.

OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY

The aforementioned study by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) considered achievement in the light of how much opportunity had been afforded students to learn the material included on tests. How can children be expected to learn, lacking the opportunity to do so? It will be recalled that IEA testers found this factor to be significant in explaining variations in achievement.

Typically, achievement studies in the United States have not considered the opportunity to learn as a factor. Instead, the assumption has been made that all learning is created equal. Variations of teacher quality, differential opportunities arising from other school functions, and the duration of school day and school year are all of possible significance in conditioning achievement.

On any given day in 1965, two-fifths of the classrooms in Chicago where teachers were absent had no substitute teachers. On a racial basis, the rate of uncovered classes for schools in predominantly black school districts (data were not released by school) was three times that in predominantly white districts.[82] In some instances, children without a substitute teacher were sent to another room, thereby overcrowding that room and undoubtedly disturbing its normal learning atmosphere. Other children were presided over by an older child, assigned from one of the upper grades to maintain order, at the most. Even in cases where a substitute teacher was available, often little occurred that was related to previous learning. Teacher absence and substitute assignment data are readily available as part of payroll records. They are rarely published. The use of older children as "teachers" is – besides being illegal in most States – exceedingly difficult to quantify. Achievement studies omit the entire impact of teacher absence.

On a broader scale, Wiley and Harnischfeger have asked how achievement is affected by specific amounts of schooling. In one sample consisting of schools in Detroit, they found—after taking attendance data into account—that the actual number of hours in school ranged from 710 to 1,150 per year.[83] ". . . In schools where students receive 24 percent more schooling," conclude the researchers, "they will increase their average gain in reading comprehension by two-thirds and their gains in mathematics and verbal skills by more than one-third."[84] With respect to how much productive learning occurs during school hours, the comment of Bloom is suggestive: "On the basis of simple observational studies it appears that in some countries students are actively engaged in learning for 90 percent or more of class time, while in other countries . . . only about 50 percent of the time."[85]

Findings of class and race differentials in academic achievement say a great deal about the limitations of schools as they are presently organized. In Coleman's phrase, such research results show "that schools do very little to reduce inequality. . . ."[86]

CONCLUSION

For many years, educators and researchers often believed that minority children were incapable of standard academic achievement. Recent research has unsettled this assumption. The work of Rohwer, for example, fairly establishes the proficiency of minority children in conceptual learning. Since minority children have been found to be more dependent than other children on schools, the question has arisen of how effectively schools can teach. An international view of this question reveals that the school is much more important than many American studies have conceded.

A new concept of schools as places to learn is emerging from studies in the U.S. as well as overseas. Research by Winkler, Mayeske, and Guthrie suggests that the citizenry expect more from the schools. Children are less and less being regarded as fated to low achievement by virtue of their race and class.

Schools can inhibit as well as promote learning. Research at Michigan State University and elsewhere suggests that the climate of schools with large minority enrollments is too often a factor in restraining rather than encouraging academic achievement. Ability grouping and tracking operate similarly, although researchers are not unanimous on this view. Schools also incorporate within their daily routines, a structure of discouragement of minority children. The larger community transmits its evaluations of these children and their families to the school system. Organized minority community resistance has at times succeeded in moderating such evaluations. It is erroneous to interpret achievement failures as aspects of individual failure without investigating the impact of discriminatory patterns on the child and its schools.

Traditional research into educational achievement usually assumes equality of resources and tends to attribute failures to characteristics of individual children. The assumption is widely held—but little researched—that students on the average are equally endowed with school resources. It is widely conceded that historical patterns of resource distribution were unequal. Without establishing the time or manner in which these patterns were changed, the arbitrary conclusion is reached that resource inequalities are a thing of the past. Detailed, empirical studies of individual schools do not support that conviction; in some large cities, school-to-school inequalities are evident. Another inequality is the physical opportunity to study or learn. In any event, researchers must recognize the existence of unequal resource distribution if they are to create a realistic portrait of academic achievement in the contemporary school.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Eduardo Seda Bonilla, "Bilingual Education in a Pluralistic Context," *Rican*, 1 (May, 1974), p. 20.

[2] Jerome Kagan, "The Poor Are Educable," *New York Times*, January 16, 1974.

[3] William D. Rohwer, Jr., Mary Sue Ammon, Nancy Suzuki, and Joel R. Levin, "Population Differences and Learning Proficiency," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62(1971), p. 13.

[4] Richard B. Green and William D. Rohwer, Jr., "SES Differences on Learning and Ability Tests in Black Children," *American Educational Research Journal*, 8(1971), p. 608.

[5] Daniel W. Kee and William D. Rohwer, Jr., "Noun-Pair Learning in Four Ethnic Groups," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65 (1973), p. 231.

[6] Daniel W. Kee, "Learning Efficiency in Four Ethnic Groups," *Integrated Education*, 10(November-December 1972), p. 32.

[7] William D. Rohwer, Jr., "Learning, Race, and School Success," *Review of Educational Research*, 41(1971), p. 198. See, however, Anna Leifer, "Mosaics of Disadvantaged Negro and White Preschoolers Compared," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 121(1972), pp. 59-63.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 208. See, also, Philip J. Scrofani, Antanas Suziedelis, and Milton F. Shore, "Conceptual Ability in Black and White Children of Different Social Classes," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 43(1973), 541-553; Barbara K. Keough and Donald L. Macmillan, "Effects of Motivational and Presentation Conditions on Digit Recall of Children of Differing Socioeconomic, Racial, and Intelligence Groups," *American Educational Research Journal*, 8(January 1971), pp. 27-38; and Carl Bereiter, "A Nonpsychological Approach to Early Compensatory Education," pp. 337-346 in Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).

[9] Short discussions of the work of the IEA can be found in Fritz Mosher, "Harvard-IEA Conference: A Harvard View," *Harvard Graduate School of Education Alumni Bulletin*, 18(Spring-Summer 1974), pp. 35-38; Benjamin S. Bloom, "Implications of the IEA Studies for Curriculum and Instruction," *School Review*, 82(May 1974), pp. 413-435; William E. Coffman and Lai-Min Paul Lee, "Cross-National Assessment of Educational Achievement: A Review," *Educational Researcher*, 3(June 1974), pp. 13-16; and Torsten Husen, "Multi-National Evaluation of School Systems: Purposes, Methodology, and Some Preliminary Findings," *Scandanavian Journal of Educational Research*, 18(1974), pp. 13-39.

[10] L. C. Comber and John P. Keeves, *Science Education in Nineteen Countries. An Empirical Study* (New York: Wiley, 1973), pp. 195-196.

[11] James S. Coleman, Effects of School on Learning: The IEA Findings (mimeo, 1974).

[12] Sheldon H. White and others, *Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations*, I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 291.

[13] Bloom, "Implications of the IEA Studies for Curriculum and Instruction," p. 418.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 420.

[15] George W. Mayeske, Tetsuo Okada, Wallace M. Cohen, Albert E. Beaton, Jr., and Carl E. Wisler, *A Study of the Achievement of Our Nation's Students* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 12.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[17] Donald R. Winkler, *School Inputs, Educational Production, and the Achievement Gap Bewteen Blacks and Whites*, p. 7, a paper presented to the December 1972 winter meeting of the Econometric Society.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[20] George W. Mayeske, Carl. E. Wisler, Albert E. Beaton, Jr., Frederic D. Weinfeld, Wallace M. Cohen, Tetsuo Okada, John M. Proshek, and Kenneth A. Tabler, *A Study of Our Nation's Schools. A Working Paper* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, [1970]), pp. 331-333.

[21] James W. Guthrie, George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout, *Schools and Inequality* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1971), p. 90.

[22] Eric Hanushek, "The Production of Education, Teacher Quality, and Efficiency," p. 94 in U.S. Office of Education, *Do Teachers Make a Difference?* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970).

[23] Stephan Michelson, "The Association of Teacher Resourceness with Children's Characteristics," p. 127 in *Ibid.*

[24] *Ibid.*, footnote 11, p. 163 (emphasis in original).

[25] Gordon W. Miller, "Factors in School Achievement and Social Class," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 61(1970), p. 268. See, also, Francis H. Palmer, "Socioeconomic Status and Intellective Performance among Negro Preschool Boys," *Developmental Psychology*, 3(1970), pp. 1-9.

[26] Kenneth B. Clark, "Cultural Deprivation Theories: Their Social and Psychological Implication," p. 7 in *The Educationally Deprived. The Potential for Change* (New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center, 1972).

[27] Ronald Davis Henderson, *A Comparative Analysis of Social-Psychological School Climate Variables in White and Black Elementary Schools With Socio-Economic Status and Achievement Controlled* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972), p. 4.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

[29] Jeffery Michael Schneider, *An Investigation of Social-Psychological Variables Comprising School Normative Academic Climate in High- and Low-Achieving White-Urban, Black-Urban, and Rural Elementary Schools*

With School Mean Socio-Economic Status Controlled (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973), p. 121.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[31] W. B. Brookover, Richard Gigliotti, Ronald Henderson, and Jeffery Schneider, *A Brief Description of a Study of Elementary School Social Climates and School Achievement, undated, p. 7.*

[32] Edmund Dean Meyers, Jr., *Effects of Social and Educational Climate of High Schools Upon the Academic Performance of Negro and White Adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967), p. 200.

[33] *Ibid*,p. 200.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 284 (emphasis in original).

[36]

[37] A. G. Davey, "Teachers, Race, and Intelligence," *Race*, 15 (October 1973), p. 208.

[38] Robert L. Crain, (ed.), *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of Desegregation*, I (Chicago, Ill.: National Opinion Research Center, October, 1973), p. 81. (ERIC ED 085 426)

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. v.

[41] Rupert N. Evans and Joel D. Galloway, "Verbal Ability and Socioeconomic Status of 9th and 12th Grade College Preparatory, General, and Vocational Students," *Journal of Human Resources*, 8(1973), pp. 34-35.

[42] Ibid., p. 36.

[43] Roger Hugh Kariger, *The Relationship of Lane Grouping to the Socioeconomic Status of the Parents of Seventh Grade Pupils in Three Junior High Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962), p. 82.

[44] Bernard Mackler, "Grouping in the Ghetto," *Education and Urban Society*, 2(1969), p. 82.

[45] *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

[46] Bernard Mackler, "Up From Poverty: The Price of 'Making It' In a Ghetto School," p. 121 in A. Harry Passow (ed.), *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972).

[47] Bernard Mackler, "Blacks Who Are Academically Successful," *Urban Education, 5(October 1970), p. 213.*

[48] Barbara Lee Heyns, *Curriculum Assignment and Tracking Policies in Forty-Eight Urban Public High Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971), p. 136.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[50] *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

[52] Walter E. Schafer and Carol Olexa, *High School Track Position and Academic Achievement*, April 1969, p. 14. (ERIC ED 303 188)

[53] Heyns, *Curriculum Assignment and Tracking Policies in Forty-Eight Urban Public High Schools*, p. 118.

[54] John U. Ogbu, *The Next Generation. An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood* (New York: Academic Press, 1974), p. 10 (emphasis in original).

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 199.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 200.

[62] Jonathan H. Turner, "Structural Conditions of Achievement Among Whites and Blacks in the Rural South," *Social Problems*, 19(Spring 1972), p. 501.

[63] *Ibid.*, footnote 9, p. 502.

[64] John Hope Franklin, "Jim Crow Goes to School: The Genesis of Legal Segregation in the South," in Charles E. Wynes (ed.), *The Negro in the South Since 1865* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1965), p. 147.

[65] Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order*, p. 170.

[66] Herbert W. Robinson, Jr., in *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, March 28, 1970.

[67] Shelby Counce, in *ibid.*, March 27, 1970.

[68] Jay Irwin Stark, *The Pattern of Resource Allocation in Education: The Detroit Public Schools 1940 to 1960* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 62.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[70] David Vincent, "The Uneducation of Black Students," *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, March 27, 1970.

[71] Stark, *The Pattern of Resource Allocation in Education*, p. 63.

[72] See Oliver Walker, "The Windsor Hills Story," *Integrated Education*, 8(May-June 1970), pp. 4-9.

[73] See *Integrated Education*, 8(September-October 1970), pp. 63-64.

[74] Richard A Berk and Alice Hartmann, "Race and School Funds in Chicago, 1971," *Integrated Education*, 10(January-February, 1972), p. 57.

[75] Herbert J. Walberg and Mark Bargen, "School Equality," in Herbert J. Walberg (ed.), *Evaluating Educational Performance. A Sourcebook of Methods, Instruments, and Examples* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974), p. 237.

[76] Jacob Landers, "Profiles of Inequality in New York City," *Integrated Education*, 11(January-February 1973), p. 10.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 13. See, also, Daniel Dobin, *The Failure of Academic High Schools in New York City* (Brooklyn N.Y..: Brooklyn Education Task Force, 1970) and Carol Wielk, "White Academic Failure in Brooklyn High Schools," *Community*, 2(February 1970).

[79] Jacob Landers, Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters," November 16, 1967, pp. 21-22.

[80] See, Martin T. Katzman, *The Political Economy of Urban Schools* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), which – despite its title – deals not with *schools* but school *districts* composed of up to five schools each. The same conceptual problem is true of

Arthur R. Jensen, "Do Schools Cheat Minority Children?" *Educational Research,* 14(1971), pp. 3-28, a detailed study of a 35-school district as well as of 191 school districts in 10 counties. In no case are figures presented for individual schools. While economists and psychologists persist in studying school districts, children continue attending schools.

[81] See John D. Owen, *Racial Bias in the Allocation of Teachers in Sixty-Nine Urban Elementary School Systems,* November 1969, ERIC ED 034 838 and Eric Jay Toder, *The Distribution of Public School Teachers by Race and Income Class in an Urban Metropolitan Area. Final Report,* March 1971, ERIC ED 050 210.

[82] "The Chicago Title VI Complaint to HEW," *Integrated Education,* 3(December 1965-January 1966), p. 16.

[83] David E. Wiley and Annegret Harnischfeger, "Explosion of a Myth: Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles," *Educational Researcher,* 3(April 1974), p. 8.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[85] Bloom, "Implications of the IEA Studies for Curriculum and Instruction," p. 420.

[86] James S. Coleman, "Equalizing Achievement - A False Ideal?" *Miami Herald,* August 12, 1973.

CHAPTER 6
DESEGREGATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

In 1965 a Federal official in charge of desegregation enforcement activities replied to a congressional inquiry about the relative lack of research on desegregation: "The basic problem is there are very few researchers that want to work on it for some reason, but it is a very real problem."[1] Since then, the situation has improved only somewhat. Essentially researchers and institutions of higher education and organized research have continued their disinclination to deal with desegregation. Research grants in desegregation are generally unavailable.

As a result, too little is known of this historic development. Failure to deal extensively with it has permitted a certain degree of ambiguity in terminology to enter both learned and popular discourse. The most elementary facts concerning the extent and breadth of the movement are not firmly established.

TERMINOLOGY

A clarification of certain key terms would seem to be in order. These are: segregation, desegregation, integration, and deprivation.

For purposes of this study *segregation* is defined as a socially patterned separation of people, with or without explicit sanction. The legal distinction between *de facto* and *de jure* segregation has not been found to be of any consequence in studying the impact of segregation upon children. The essential mark of a segregated school is not the presence of a certain ethnic mixture although a number of practical measures of the mixture have been offered by students of the problem. Fundamentally, a school is segregated when the community comes to view the school in its nature to be inferior and unsuitable for privileged children. For example, a school is segregated whenever it becomes known as a "Negro school." The stigma imposed upon the school by the community makes it segregated; virtually always, a stigmatized school will be deprived of an equal share of community resources inasmuch as the control of the resources, too, is socially patterned.

If a school is considered by the community to be adequate for minority children but not for majority children, that school is segregated. A pragmatic test of this distinction is easily applied to what is often called "reverse busing," i.e., the busing of white children to a predominantly Negro school. White parents most frequently–and at times with justification–object that the transfer would result in their children being placed in a poor school with a negative effect on their learning. The significant point is not the accuracy of the white complaint but the tacit assumption by whites that the same contention does not apply to the Negro children.

Desegregation is defined as the abolition of social practices that bar equal access to opportunity or that bar equal access to the mainstream of American life. The effort is to create new patterns of interaction by altering the organizational and administrative structures that contribute to segregation. Desegregation is a matter that can be effectuated through administrative measures. Desegregation needs only to be decided, and it can be done; its success does not require special kinds of children or teachers or adminstrators.

The significance of desegregation is missed, however, if it is characterized merely as "moving bodies." To be sure the attendance of Negro and white children in a common school is the most obvious feature of desegregation. It is psychological naivete to imagine that such attendance in a race conscious society is without consequence for the students involved. The research results reported in the present work suggest that the consequences are pervasive, profound, and complex.

Integration is defined as the realization of equal opportunity: "Education which is equally bad for everyone is not integrated education; it simply skimps educational opportunity in like manner for all. Thus, integrated education of low quality is a contradiction in terms."[2]

In an integrated school, individual differences would bear no stigma as it became clear that these were not social distinctions in disguise. Students, teachers, and administrators would cease making invidious comparisons as differences ceased being stigmatic. Acceptance, mutual respect, and cooperation are the tempers of an integrated school.

The term *deprivation* is defined as the socially patterned withholding of educational opportunity from selected groups of persons. Reference is to a group pattern and not to isolated deprived persons. The concept of deprivation implies withheld advantages and this would seem to be more adequately conceived as a group phenomenon. Deprivation and *privilege* are opposites, even though the privilege be merely the right to attend a white school that is only slightly less inferior than the Negro school. Segregation has, of course, often been used to allocate opportunities among the deprived as well as the privileged; indeed, it is a question whether it has ever been used for anything else. Problems of deprivation are compounded by consideration of race and class. All the deprived, more or less, are also segregated. But for Negroes in American society, race is an additional depressive factor.

SCOPE OF DESEGREGATION

The absence of precise statistics on school segregation dating from 1950 makes it difficult to ascertain exact changes since then. Some figures are available, however, and fairly reliable estimates may be made. The present estimate is necessarily restricted to changes in the number of children attending one-race schools in 1950 and 1972, as follows:[3]

Estimated Attendence in One-Race Schools

	1950	1972
Number of black students	3,100,000	6,800,000
Attending all-black schools:		
Number	2,650,000	760,000
Percent	85.5	11.2
Number of white students	24,500,000	35,000,000
Attending all-white schools:		
Number	22,350,000	3,800,000
Percent	91.2	10.8

The one-race school has all but disappeared. In this sense, the third quarter of the 20th-century has seen a vast decline in segregation, not only proportionately but also in absolute numbers. While the number of black school children more than doubled during this period, the number attending all-black schools fell by more than 70 percent. Fewer children are segregated in 1975 than at the time of the *Brown* decision in 1954.

What might have been the present situation of school segregation in the absence of the social changes that marked the past quarter-century is impossible to assess. One might apply the 1950 percent of children in one-race schools to the 1972 data: Instead of 760,000 blacks in all-black schools there would be 5,814,000; and instead of 3,800,000 whites in all-white schools, there would be 31,920,000—in all, a total of 37,734,000 instead of 4,560,000 black and white children in single-race schools.

Data on desegregation during the years 1954-1967 are slim and unreassuring due to lack of specificity. From 1968 on, however, a new order of data became available which are considerably more complete than earlier compilations. Collected by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and customarily distributed publicly, the new figures originate from periodic reports by school districts. While the reports are not audited, they form the basis for the most satisfactory data yet. Tables 1-3 are based primarily on data in the OCR reports for 1972, the latest available.

The table *Minority children in public schools, fall 1972,* indicates that the four minority groups account for 9.7 million, or more than one-fifth of all public school students. Black children were the most segregated; Oriental children, the least. More than 45 percent of all black children were attending overwhelmingly black schools, while slightly over 36 percent went to predominantly white schools. Spanish-surnamed children were less segregated.

The table *Geographical distribution of black children in public schools, fall 1972,* illustrates important regional contrasts and comparisons. The 11 States South is by all odds less segregated than either the border or the northern and western States. In the South, more than 46 percent of the black children attended predominantly white schools as compared with 28 percent in the North and West. The border States and the District of Columbia, which until the late 1960's led the South in desegregation came to resemble more closely the northern situation. In fact, border States replaced the old South as the most segregated of the three areas.

The 100 school districts enrolling the largest number of students contain 51 percent of the country's black students. As a group, these districts–all primarily urban–are more segregated than the rest of the country. (The districts are divided equally between North and South.) Firm Federal court orders have not been applied widely to large northern school districts. In the South, such orders have been considerably less sweeping in the larger cities than in medium–and small-sized cities and in rural areas.

The table *Geographical distribution of white children in public schools, fall 1972,* demonstrates that white children are more isolated than minority group children. (The table, however, cannot distinguish between school districts containing only white children and those that are multiracial. Isolation in the latter type of districts is the more significant.) In the South there are proportionately twice as many whites in virtually all-white schools as there are blacks in virtually all-black schools. In the North, on the other hand, while the absolute level of segregation is higher than in the South, the disproportion between black and white isolation is not as extreme. In part, this is a ceiling effect. Since nearly 90 percent of white children already attend virtually all-white schools, there is not much room for further increase.

In historical perspective, desegregation has made startling progress since 1950 As sketched in chapters one and two, most of that forward movement has occurred since the mid-1960's. So swift has been the flow of events that the full scope of the change is not generally recognized. In more contemporary perspective, desegregation may be seen in its incompleteness. It is unevenly spread geographically and by ethnic group. These very incongruities help impel the development of judicial doctrines that will undoubtedly, over time, extend the reach and impact of desegregation.

Desegregation has become a major force in American education. It is not longer a debating issue. That racial barriers in the schools must go has been decided with the authority of legislature and courts, in addition to a growing public opinion. The fits and starts of momentary opposition can hardly deter so basic a force.

In the course of this book, studies of desegregation will be reviewed along with research on related topics that helps generate understanding of desegregation. To many, research seems like a jackpot, which if "hit," will produce precise and plentiful rewards or answers. But, as Veblen warned years ago, "the outcome of any serious research can only be to make two questions grow where one question grew before."[4] The light comes but it also uncovers new dark corners.

LEARNING UNDER SEGREGATION

Around the time of the 1954 Supreme Court desegregation decision, numerous school systems started to publish achievement test scores of Negro and white students. Without exception, the results showed a vary large gap between the two. These discrepancies existed after more than a half century of a theoretical "separate-but-equal" national school policy.

During 1953-54, the Texas Association of School Administrators surveyed achievement of 80 percent of the state's school children. "In most cases," it was reported, "the achievement of white pupils as measured by standard test scores was very satisfactory; most Negro pupils were performing unsatisfactorily when judgments were made on the basis of tests."[5] In 1950, a survey in Dade

Minority children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

Minority	Total	Percent of total U.S. enrollment	Attending predominantly majority schools		Attending 50.0-79 percent minority schools		Attending 80.0 minority
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Black	6,796,238	15.2	2,465,377	36.3	1,258,277	18.5	3,072,582
Spanish Surname	2,414,179	5.4	1,050,700	43.6	568,055	23.5	795,423
American Indian	232,766	0.5	152,318	65.4	26,193	11.3	54,256
Oriental	233,190	0.5	164,668	70.6	42,513	18.2	26,009
Total minority	9,676,373	21.7	3,833,063	39.6	1,895,038	19.6	3,948,269
Total U.S. enrollment	44,646,625	100.0					

[1] Basic data from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in pub* *and secondary schools.* This document, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of numbers and to computer rounding. The total for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs public schools. Data on Hawaii are not included in any of these figures.

Minority children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

Total	Percent of total U.S. enrollment	Attending predominantly majority schools		Attending 50.0-79 percent minority schools		Attending 80.0-100.0 percent minority schools	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
796,238	15.2	2,465,377	36.3	1,258,277	18.5	3,072,582	45.2
414,179	5.4	1,050,700	43.6	568,055	23.5	795,423	32.9
232,766	0.5	152,318	65.4	26,193	11.3	54,256	23.3
233,190	0.5	164,668	70.6	42,513	18.2	26,009	11.2
676,373	21.7	3,833,063	39.6	1,895,038	19.6	3,948,269	40.8
646,625	100.0						

partment of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in public elementary*
This document, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of numbers and totals are due
The total for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in non-
Hawaii are not included in any of these figures.

Geographical distribution of black children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

Area	Total area enrollment	Black school children in area		Attending predominantly majority schools		Attending 50.0-79.9 percent minority schools		Attend perc
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Numbe
United States	44,646,625	6,796,238	15.2	2,465,377	36.3	1,258,277	18.5	3,072,58
32 northern and western States	29,916,241	3,250,806	10.9	919,393	28.2	512,631	15.8	1,818,78
6 border States and District of Columbia	3,742,703	650,828	17.4	206,844	31.8	54,749	8.4	389,23
11 southern States	10,987,680	2,894,603	26.3	1,339,140	46.2	690,898	23.9	864,56
100 largest school districts	10,275,264	3,465,635	33.7	701,943	20.3	420,250	12.1	2,343,44

[1] Basic data from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in publi*
and secondary schools. This document, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of numbers and
to computer rounding. The total for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs
public schools. Data on Hawaii are not included in any of these figures.

Geographical distribution of black children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

	Black school children in area		Attending predominantly majority schools		Attending 50.0-79.9 percent minority schools		Attending 80.0-100.0 percent minority schools	
nt	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
25	6,796,238	15.2	2,465,377	36.3	1,258,277	18.5	3,072,581	45.2
241	3,250,806	10.9	919,393	28.2	512,631	15.8	1,818,782	56.0
703	650,828	17.4	206,844	31.8	54,749	8.4	389,235	59.8
680	2,894,603	26.3	1,339,140	46.2	690,898	23.9	864,564	29.9
264	3,465,635	33.7	701,943	20.3	420,250	12.1	2,343,442	67.6

tment of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in public elementary*
is document, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of numbers and totals are due
e total for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in non-
waii are not included in any of these figures.

Geographic distribution of white children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

Area	Total area enrollment	White school children in area		Attending predominantly minority schools		Attending 50.0-79.9 Percent Majority schools		Attending Percen sc
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
United States	44,646,625	34,970,252	78.3	1,295,992	3.7	5,155,248	14.7	28,518,9
32 northern and western States	29,916,241	24,565,942	82.1	663,652	2.7	2,365,776	9.6	21,536,5
6 border States and District of Columbia	3,742,703	3,031,885	81.0	43,305	1.4	297,321	9.8	2,691,2
11 southern States	10,987,680	7,372,425	67.1	589,035	8.0	2,492,155	33.8	4,291,2
100 largest school districts	10,275,264	NA		NA		NA		

---

[1] Basic data from U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in public* *and secondary schools.* This document, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of number and to to computer rounding. The total for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs an public schools. Data on Hawaii are not included in any of these figures. In this table, "white" is equated with HEW's "nonminority".

Geographic distribution of white children in public schools, fall 1972[1]

White school children in area		Attending predominantly minority schools		Attending 50.0-79.9 Percent Majority schools		Attending 80.0-100.0 Percent Majority schools	
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
34,970,252	78.3	1,295,992	3.7	5,155,248	14.7	28,518,981	81.6
24,565,942	82.1	663,652	2.7	2,365,776	9.6	21,536,506	87.7
3,031,885	81.0	43,305	1.4	297,321	9.8	2,691,258	88.8
7,372,425	67.1	589,035	8.0	2,492,155	33.8	4,291,234	58.2
NA		NA		NA		NA	

t of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Fall, 1972 racial and ethnic enrollment in public elementary*
cument, unlike its predecessors, was not released publicly. Minute differences between sum of number and totals are due
l for American Indians does not include those enrolled in schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and in non-
are not included in any of these figures. In this table, "white" is equated with HEW's "nonminority".

County, Fl., of arithmetic achievement by eighth graders found white children ahead of national norms while Negro children lagged by 2 years.[6] Negro sixth graders in Nashville were more than 2 years behind white students in overall achievement.[7]

In the North, the situation was far from satisfactory. During 1954 Ferguson and Plaut surveyed the senior classes of 32 public high schools in 11 northern States. Out of a total of 10,388 seniors, about a third–3,337–were Negroes. Only 24 of these 3,337 were in the upper quarter of their class and could offer the necessary minimum number of college admission units.[8] In New York City, during November 1959, half of all seventh graders were reading more than 2 years below normal level;[9] a majority of these children were Negroes and Puerto Ricans. In 1963, more than 80 percent of sixth graders in central Harlem schools were reading below normal level.[10] Landers has reported that in 1966 "the typical central Harlem student in grade 5 was retarded 1 year and 1 month."[11]

Evidence is contradictory as to the universality among Negro youths of progressive relative declines in IQ. However, there is an almost universally acknowledged relative drop in academic achievement among Negro school children as they "progress" in school. Whether the research procedure is longitudinal or cross sectional, the result is the same. Harris and Lovinger found that their subjects – who had not lost in IQ scores – nevertheless lagged a year and a half behind the achievement norm for seventh grade.[12] Long found the same in a study of District of Columbia Negro third graders.[13] "The signs indicate," according to Long, "that there is a tendency in our groups for scores in intelligence and achievement to vary inversely... One must consider the possibility of accounting for the difference in terms of environment or miseducation."[14] In the main, the aforementioned low IQ and achievement scores of Negro children occurred in a context of segregation.

Does attendance at racially mixed schools bring about any changes in achievement? An adequate response requires examination of achievement under two types of conditions: interraciality and desegregation. Included under *interraciality* are situations in which black and white children attend school together but without any indication or consideration of how the common attendance originated. It might reflect the existence of a nonsegregated housing area. *Desegregation* refers to situations in which common attendance results from a conscious policy whereby formerly segregated children now attend school together. It also includes situations in which the focus is not on individual children but on schools.

While all desegregated schools are interracial, not all interracial schools have been desegregated. A school which has never been segregated can hardly desegregate. Both types of schools are interrelated. A study of one can throw light on the other. Yet, caution should be used not to treat the two as one.

ACHIEVEMENT AND INTERRACIALITY

In 1913, Mayo made a study of the school grades of Negro and white students in two New York City high schools. He found no very great differences between the two groups. Nevertheless, he reported: "Relative retardation... would seem to be characteristic of the high school colored group.... The colored pupils are about three-quarters as efficient as the whites in the pursuit of high school studies."[15] Yet, white students were more likely to become dropouts.[16]

Witty and Decker studied Negro and white achievement in the schools of Coffeyville, Kans. in 1927.[17] The sample included 1,725 white and 220 Negro students. The latter scored consistently lower on a battery of achievement tests. The smallest gap was on a test of history and literature. The researchers remarked: "The success of the children upon this test suggests that the Negroes studied must be functioning *far below* capacity in many school subjects."[18]

In 1932, Crowley compared Negro achievement in segregated and nonsegregated schools in Cincinnati.[19] Two groups of 55 Negro children were selected from two segregated and four non-segregated interracial schools. The groups were equated as to grades, age, mental age, and IQ scores. Students were not specifically matched by socioeconomic measures although Crowley stated that "the school records and social histories indicated that the groups were equated in respect to ... social status ..."[20] A battery of standard achievement tests was administered. Students in the interracial nonsegregated schools scored significantly higher in writing and spelling. In the remaining tests, no significant differences were found.

A 1964 study of the Portland, Oreg., high schools divided Negro and non-Negro students according to grades and the racial and social composition of the elementary schools they had attended. Seniors who had earned a grade point average of "C" or higher were classified as follows:[21]

Racial and social composition of elementary school
(in percents)

Students	25 percent or more Negro	5-24 percent Negro	Lower income white	Middle income white	High income white
Negro	32%	38%	8%	33%	0
Non-Negro	70%	69%	70%	76%	85%

Utilizing national survey data gathered in 1966, Crain studied the impact on black achievement of having attended an interracial nonsegregated school. He found a positive effect even after allowing for socioeconomic differences. In part, the beneficial outcome resulted from more adequate resources and higher socioeconomic students in the interracial nonsegregated school. But in addition, Crain reported, attendance at an interracial school clarified to the black student what "it means to live in a white man's world."[22] The added social and personal realism stimulated the Negro child to higher achievement.

Crain and Weisman undertook a further analysis, published in 1974. They found the beneficial effect of attending nonsegregated schools to extend considerably beyond academic achievement as measured by tests. The students were more likely to complete high school than drop out; attend college rather than not; and enter occupations customarily closed to blacks. For northern blacks, attendance at nonsegregated schools also was associated with higher incidence and degree of home ownership, financial responsibility, and job stability. In the past, such findings had often been interpreted as results of higher socioeconomic position of Negro children in nonsegregated schools. Crain and Weisman, however, reported that "surprisingly, black students in integrated schools do not come from higher status families than those in segregated schools."[23]

Laurent studied six schools located in the Hilltop area of Tacoma, Wash., over the years 1963-1967. In 1963, only 6.6 percent of citywide enrollment consisted of Negro students; by 1968, it had risen to 8.9 percent. In analyzing the impact of race on achievement, he considered the school as a whole rather than the classroom. Laurent found little evidence of any racial effect on achievement.[24]

Matzen studied the effect of racial composition upon achievement in the San Francisco Bay area.[25] He stated his problem as: "What is the relationship between the proportion of Negro children in a classroom and the mean scholastic achievement of Negro and nonNegro students?"[26] Some 1,100 students in 11 schools were tested; only Negroes and Caucasians were included. The tests were administered to fifth and seventh grade students from October 15 to November 1, 1963. Findings were reported according to four major relationships: (1) percent of Negroes and achievement; (2) percent of Negroes and mean intellectual ability; (3) mean intellectual ability and achievement; and (4) socioeconomic status and achievement.

1. In general, there was a tendency for achievement to vary inversely with percent Negro (PN). Of 21 fifth grade classrooms, data for five showed exceptional trends. For example 31 students in classroom number 20 were below average in socioeconomic status, above average in achievement and IQ, and well below average in proportion of Negroes (5.9 percent vs. 51.7 percent). Classroom number 6 was considerably above average in IQ score, below average in achievement, and very high in percent Negro. Matzen suggests that much of the negative relationship between PN and achievement may be attributable to common practices of classroom grouping. For example, relatively few high achieving Negro 5th graders would have been placed in classrooms with high achieving whites. Most would remain in class with lower achieving Negroes. Thus the test results showed negative relationship between race and achievement.

2. IQ, like achievement, tends to vary inversely with PN. Matzen stresses, however, the presence of "numerous exceptions" and characterizes the relationship between the two variables as "far from perfect."[27]

3. Achievement varies directly with socioeconomic position. However, while the entire student sample was heavily lower class, over half

of the fifth graders achieved above grade level; only one-third of the seventh graders were above grade level.

4. Matzen then tried to discover how achievement and PN were related when he held IQ and socioeconomic status constant. Achievement tended to fall as PN rose, but the tendency was not strong enough to reach statistical significance. In other words, PN—by itself—turned out not to be a depressive factor, and became so only when combined with low socioeconomic status and low IQ. Matzen acknowledged that white parents might nevertheless interpret the situation as demonstrating conclusively the negative influence of Negroes on white achievement. Because achievement scores of Negro children also tend to decline as PN increases, Matzen wrote: "It appears that Negro parents may have stronger grounds than non-Negro parents for objecting to attendance boundaries which assign their children to predominantly Negro schools."[28]

And yet, PN and achievement were differently related in fifth grade than in seventh grade. One possible reason offered by Matzen is a difference in classroom grouping practices. In the fifth grade, students were much less homogeneously grouped than in seventh grade; therefore, Negro-white differences were greater in grade five. In grade seven, grouping was quite homogeneous with bright Negro children being placed in classrooms with bright white children. Negro-white differences were thus minimized. In the fifth grade one would likely find equal numbers of Negroes and whites in the low-scoring as in the high-scoring classrooms. In the seventh grade, high-scoring whites tended to be in one classroom, and low-scoring Negroes in another one. In the latter case, the negative relation between PN and achievement was high; in the former case, it was low.

Clearly, it is quite possible to interpret Matzen's findings as indicating that the presence of Negroes must be minimized if achievement is to be maximized. Matzen prefers an alternative explanation, one that he calls "equally plausible." This is his suggestion: that a new variable called educational quality (EQ) be constructed. Making up this variable would be indices of "teacher competence and motivation, quality of textbooks and other instructional materials, enrichment value of the classroom and school environment, and similar determinates, *on the school's side*, of how much pupils learn."[29] Matzen hypothesizes that EQ would be found to be negatively correlated with PN, and positively related to IQ, achievement, and socioeconomic position. In short, with schools of equal quality, the percent of Negroes in a classroom could no longer have a negative effect on achievement. But, adds Matzen, the racial composition of the classrooms "would still be a matter of great moment to parents and educators as a determiner of the social and emotional aspects of student development."[30]

In 1967, McPartland studied the effect of school and classroom desegregation on academic achievement.[31] He used verbal achievement test scores derived from 5,075 Negro ninth graders in New England and Middle Atlantic States.

Weighted parameters of main effects on ninth grade Negro student verbal achievement, under different control conditions

1. Proportions white classmates (3 comparisons	.16
2. Proportion white classmates, (controlling family background (18))	.13
3. Proportion white classmates, controlling family background and percent white in school (72)	.13
(a) 0–19 percent white in school (18)	.07
(b) 20–49 percent white in school (18)	.16
(c) 50–69 percent white in school (18)	.19
(d) 70–99 percent white in school (18)	.34
4. Percent white in school (3)	.13
5. Percent white in school, controlling family background (18)	.11
6. Percent white in school, controlling family background and proportion white classmates (72)	.02
(a) No white classmates (18)	-.03
(b) Less than half white classmates (18)	-.02
(c) About half white classmates (18)	.03
(d) More than half white classmates (18)	.09

The numbers in parentheses are the number of comparisons which were combined in the weighted average of achievement increments. Each value in this table is based on 5,075 cases.

McPartland's work was directly relevant to several research questions that had arisen in earlier investigation:

1. Do racial effects in achievement persist even when social class factors are taken into account?
2. Is there a different racial effect on achievement in desegregated schools as contrasted with desegrated classrooms?
3. Are racial effects on achievement simply artifacts of ability grouping procedures?

Five generalizations can be made: (1), Racial classroom desegregation has a positive effect on achievement; this influence is for the most part independent of family background; compare lines 1 and 2; (2), "... regardless of the racial composition of the school, the average achievement of Negro students increases with the proportion of their classmates who are white;"[32] compare lines 2 and 3; 3) the whiter" the school, the more beneficial is classroom desegregation to the Negro child; compare lines 3a–3d; (4), "... when classroom racial composition as well as family background differences are held constant, there is no evidence that the percent white enrolled in the school has any appreciable influence on Negro student achievement;"[33] compare lines 5 and 6; (5), "... Negro students who remain in segregated classes receive no benefit in terms of their academic growth from attendance at desegregated schools.... Segregated classes may be more detrimental for Negro student achievement if they occur in mostly white schools rather than mostly Negro schools;"[34] compare lines 6a-b and 6c-d.

Matzen, it will be recalled, concluded that ability grouping accounted for a good deal of what appeared to be racial differentials in achievement. McPartland found school selection processes play a minor role. He concluded, therefore, that the desegregative effect in classrooms could not be explained by the schools' selection processes, and that race was an autonomous factor.

McPartland's study utilized raw data that were gathered originally for the Coleman Report. It also reflects the reanalysis of these data that was done for the *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools* of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

McPartland has noted that his study was cross sectional, not longitudinal. Thus, strictly speaking, he did not trace the effects of desegregation. The varying percentages of Negro and white students could have existed since the building of each school in the study. At best McParland's data suggest relationships in interracial classrooms, irrespective of whether the classroom had ever been anything but interracial. Evaluated in its own right, the McPartland research is outstanding for its rigor as well as its sensitivity to the central research concerns of the field. It sets a very high standard for brevity—only 16 pages.

Gunthorpe studied Negro-white academic differentials in Copiague, Long Island.[35] The town's three elementary schools and one junior high school were almost perfectly balanced racially. Negroes made up about 21 percent of the population of the school district; another 40 percent were of Italian descent. In the junior high school, students were assigned to one of three tracks, with track A being the highest. Here is the racial composition of the tracks, by percentage:[36]

Students	Track A percent	Track B percent	Track C percent
Negroes	10.0	22.6	33.3
Whites	90.0	77.4	66.7

No significant difference was found between achievement test scores for Negro and white students in the seventh and eighth grades.[37] White students were higher (at the 5 percent level) than Negro students in social status and scholastic ability. Copiague does not have sharply different social levels among its people.

Negro students did not have poor attendance records and they participated in school programs. Yet, the school newspaper staff consisted entirely of white students, all in the highest track. Negro junior high school students did not account for a disproportionately high number of academic failures, neither did they earn a proportionate number of academic honors. Negroes, Gunthorpe concluded, were simply not being placed in a track according to their actual achievement. The principal factor in enforcing this discriminatory structure was the faculty: "Data tended to indicate that teacher standards for honors were geared toward the A track placement.... A number of Negro students could compete at the level of higher curriculum tracks."[38]

In a study of segregated and nonsegregated schooling for K-second grade in a northern suburban community, Long found that attendance in one or another type of school did not affect academic achievement.[39] His subjects had never been enrolled in schools other than those they attended at the time of the study, so no actual desegregation occurred. A hitherto all-white school had simply been opened to all children. Negro subjects were classified as upper-lower class and the whites, lower middle class. Controlling for socioeconomic status did not change Long's findings. In several respects, his study population was quite different from those reported elsewhere in this chapter. The Negro children were not severely disadvantaged; at both types of schools they scored at least at the national norms of the achievement tests; and they "had comparable staffs, facilities, and educational programs.[40] Long cautions:

> The results of this study. . . should not be interpreted as a reason for maintaining segregation. . . If benefits such as improved self-image, expanded social learnings, and increased motivation to learn can be accrued, then integrated schooling should be considered sound educational practice.[41]

Vane studied the effects of race on achievement in an unnamed suburban school district.[42] She was able to trace academic records from elementary through high school. Comparing two groups of 19 Negro children, matched by IQ score and parent's occupation, Vane found no difference in achievement. It should be noted that this is not a study of a single group of students under conditions of segregation and desegregation. In a second study, Vane and associates found that matched groups of white and Negro children performed very similarly on subtest items on the Stanford-Binet intelligence tests.[43] They noted, however, that the mean IQ score of the Negro group was 103.3, considerably higher than the southern group tested by Kennedy and associates in 1960 and 1965.[44]

Fortenberry studied Negro achievement in Oklahoma City under conditions of segregation and nonsegregation.[45] Achievement scores of a sample of eighth and ninth grade Negro students were compared with their sixth grade scores. Some of the children had never attended a desegregated school, and others had attended segregated schools through the sixth grade but a desegregated school in the seventh and eighth grades. All subjects had had statistically similar achievement test scores in sixth grade.

Findings showed that by eighth grade, students in mixed classes had gained more in arithmetic while neither group had gained more in reading. By ninth grade, children in mixed classes scored higher in arithmetic and language while the children in nonmixed classes scored higher in reading. All differences were statistically significant. Fortenberry's overall conclusion was that "in general, Negroes achieve better in mixed than in nonmixed classes."[46]

Lockwood studied certain factors in school achievement.[47] She compared Negro achievement in two racially balanced and five imbalanced schools in an upstate New York city over a 2 year period. On a global comparison, no significant achievement differences were found between children in either type of school. However, when students were divided into groups who had attended balanced or imbalanced schools for 2 years or longer significant difference emerged in favor of the children in the racially balanced schools.[48]

Radin compared Negro children in two Ypsilanti, Mich. schools with respect to achievement and IQ scores.[49] An all-Negro school and a school with 45 percent Negro enrollment were used. Students were of like socioeconomic status, and there were no significant IQ score differences between the groups. A standard achievement test was administered at the beginning and at the close of the 1964-65 school year. Although all changes favored children in the integrated school, none of the changes was statistically significant.

There is some question about the integrated character of one school. Radin herself noted that "a 45 percent Negro enrollment does not represent genuine balance in the schools inasmuch as 21 percent of the entire population is non-white."[50] An independent check discovered that as of February 15, 1966, Ypsilanti's 11 elementary schools enrolled 21.9 percent Negro students (944 of 4,312).[51] The 45 percent school would be classified as imbalanced or segregated under at least two measures: those of Robert A. Dentler and the California State Department of Education.[52] It would be difficult for such a school to escape the label of "Negro school" given its predominantly Negro faculty and its exceptional racial composition in a city of only 25,000 people.

In Waterloo, Iowa, Scott studied seriation ability of 356 Negro and white kindergarten children under conditions of segregation and nonsegregation.[53] He found the difference between racial groups so large that it obscured any difference arising from socioeconomic status. The development of seriating ability, which is closely connected with reading, was seen by Scott as possibly requiring "at least in integrated lower elementary classrooms. . . a lower teacher-pupil ratio, so that more individualized activities can be arranged in small groups."[54]

Rosenfeld made a progress report from an ongoing longitudinal study of 316 Negro and 501 white students attending six schools in western and midwestern cities. In each city, Negro students scored lowest on achievement tests and they represented a lower socioeconomic status. Nevertheless, writes Rosenfeld, "there were tests in the battery and time periods during which Negro and white students grew at the same rates when initial differences between the groups were taken into account."[55]

In New York City, Lesser and his associates conducted a study of academic achievement under varying conditions of racial balance and imbalance. Minority children in the study included Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Chinese, and Jews.[56] Some 400 children were tested for verbal ability, reasoning, numerical ability, and space conceptualization. "For every one of the four abilities measured," according to Lesser, "the children from the more integrated schools and neighborhoods showed significantly superior performance when compared to the children from racially imbalanced schools and neighborhoods."[57] A "convergence effect" was observed: "In the more racially balanced schools, the children from the various ethnic groups show quite similar scores – displaying levels of ability more similar to each other. In contrast, in the racially imbalanced schools, average test scores for each ethnic group remain markedly different."[58] Lesser held that factors other than racial composition – social class, for example – helped explain the results but that the racial factor was basic. Unfortunately, no supporting data were presented in the article and so it is not possible to assess this research.

Elliott and Badal tried to answer this question: "Does racial composition of the school make a difference in achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled?"[59] Their subjects were 4,693 fifth graders in October 1962. Schools were classified by percent Negro: 80 percent and over, 46 to 79 percent, 11 to 45 percent, and 10 percent and less. Every child took an aptitude test (SCAT) and three achievement tests (Sequential Tests of Educational Progress STEP). Mathematics achievement scores rose as the percent Negro enrolled fell. Writing achievement scores also rose for the two out of six highest ability levels of children; for the lower ability levels, no significant differences were found. Reading achievement scores seemed altogether unaffected by racial composition of school. All in all, concluded Elliott and Badal, racial composition makes no important difference for achievement when scholastic aptitude is controlled. Thus, by implication, the importance of racial desegregation was denied.

As the researchers themselves note, their study does not concern changes brought about in individual children as much as in school atmosphere. Without relating school atmosphere to classroom behavior of specific children, it is difficult to see what value resides in such a study. The main findings are as difficult to explain as the exceptions. Specifically lacking is a basis for assessing the impact of racially mixed schools upon the learning of specific children. In this real sense, the Elliott and Badal study is not a test of desegregation.

In another study of the Oakland schools, the Dumbarton research group failed to find any systematic relationship between the academic achievement of black children and the racial composition of the school. A negative achievement effect was found for white children attending nonsegregated schools. The precise reason for this finding was not determined by the researchers. One possibility they pointed to was that the lower performance lay with "certain subgroup of these children, namely those from broken homes where mothers are working."[60]

Frary and Goolsby studied the effects of compensatory education on black children in segregated and nonsegregated settings in Gulfport, Miss. Involved were 10 classrooms of first graders, 198 children in the experimental groups and 290 in a comparison group. Children in the former were assigned at random; they came from poorer homes than the black and white children in the comparison group.

Children in the nonsegregated group gained significantly more than those in the segregated group. As measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, the researchers observed the difference was "vast."[61] Goolsby and Frary also investigated the effects of ability grouping and found that children in heterogenous classes scored higher in achievement.[62] Children who had scored low on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests responded especially well to the special instructional measures. Indeed, "the achievement scores of the low-readiness, integrated Negroes exceed those for either white groups in spite of a much lower mental age mean. . . ."[63] Goolsby and Frary warn of the depressive effect on low -readiness children of being placed in a segregated classroom. In such settings "very low achievement may become the accepted norm.[64]

Epps studied black high achieving high school students in eight schools. Four of the schools were all black and located in the South; the other four were located in Detroit; two of them were segregated, the others, nonsegregated. As between northern and segregated southern students, Epps found the former to have less anxiety about doing well on tests. Socioeconomic status differences were found to be relatively weakly associated with academic achievement. Students who attended northern schools had higher occupational expectations, and in nonsegregated schools higher educational expectations as well. Epps speculated that attendance at nonsegregated schools influenced black students because of "the different kinds of relationships with teachers, students, and other people with whom the Negro student comes into contact."[65]

Encouragement by the family was found to be a powerful factor in the career of high achievers. At the same time, Epps warned, efforts to raise educational standards cannot of themselves bring lasting change. "No effort to change standards will have any effect," wrote Epps, "unless it is accompanied by meaningful opportunities for individuals to use their educational attainments for occupational and economic advancement."[66] Meanwhile, integration seemed to him the most practicable means for improving the school performance of black students.

St. John conducted several studies of race and achievement. In Pittsburgh she discovered that achievement in mathematics was higher for black ninth graders if they had attended nonsegregated elemntary schools for a large part of their early education. Academic success of the black children was dependent to a significant degree upon social acceptance by white classmates. Thus, concluded St. John, optimistic and skilled guidance by an understanding teacher is crucial in the nonsegregated school.[67] In Boston, St. John came to parallel conclusions. She studied 908 white and black sixth graders in 18 different schools, distributed among 36 classrooms. In short, she found positive association between arithmetic achievement of blacks and school percentage white. Black pupils achieved more if their schools, at present or in the past, were predominantly white.[68]

In 1966, the Coleman Report was published. With respect to interraciality and achievement, it stated:

> 1. . . .As the proportion white in a school increases, the achievement of students in each racial group increases.
>
> 2. . . .This relationship increases as grade in school increases.
>
> 3. The higher achievement of all racial and ethnic groups in schools with greater proportions of white students is largely, perhaps wholly, related to effects associated with the student body's educational background and aspirations rather than with better facilities and curriculum.
>
> 4. . . .Average test performance (for Negroes) increases as the proportion of white classmates increases. . .
>
> 5. Those students who first entered desegregated schools in the early grades do generally show slightly higher average scores than the students who first came to desegregated schools in later grades.[69]

The following year, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in a reanalysis of the Coleman data, dealt with achievement.

James McPartland and Orbert L. York supervised this part of the study.[70] A principal problem was to disentangle the effects of race and social class upon achievement. This relationship had been left somewhat indistinct in the Coleman study. In reviewing achievement scores, McPartland and York determined that "there is a positive association of achievement scores with the racial composition of the classroom, no matter what the racial composition of the school may be."[71] Is this simply an effect of social class? The researchers found that even when "holding constant the social class of the student and his school, there remains an upward trend in average achievement level as the proportion of white classmates increases."[72]

Thus, an inconsistency appeared between this finding and that of the Coleman study. In the latter, racial desegregation was accorded a minor role; in the Commission study, it is seen as major. McPartland and York suggest two reasons for the inconsistency: (1) the statistical technique used in the earlier study tended to confound class and race; and (2) the earlier study, in applying regression analysis, used the school rather than the classroom as its object of analysis. Yet, stress McPartland and York, "it is in the classroom within the school where the characteristics of the fellow students have their effects."[73] Negro students in a segregated classroom, for example, do not benefit even if the school as a whole is racially balanced. The research design employed by Coleman did not permit the making of this distinction.

A study in Richmond, Calif., directed by Alan B. Wilson[74] concluded that "racial composition of the school, while tending to favor Negro students in racially integrated schools, does not have a substantial effect – not nearly so strong as the social class composition of the school."[75] In its turn, social class composition of the school had more effect on Negro than white students. While Wilson arrived at a similar finding on several different tests, he noted that "there are hardly any Negroes in our sample in predominantly white schools or predominantly upper (social) status schools."[76] As a reult, a test could not be made across the board, i.e., the Richmond Negro sample was too small to enable Wilson to test the relation of social class and race under all conditions of color and racial composition of schools. Wilson used the school rather than the classroom as the unit of analysis.[77] Possibly the McPartland-York revision of the Coleman study's weighting of social class and race might find its parallel in Wilson's analysis if classrooms rather than school were studied. Meanwhile, there is no obvious reason to predict that this would be the case.

The staff of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held that "at each level of teacher quality and school social class, the performance of Negro students is substantially higher in majority-white than majority-Negro schools."[78] Wilson had not found this to be the case, perhaps because, as already noted he did not have a large enough sample. The Commission staff, however, had access to a larger sample, i.e., the national sample being restudied by McPartland and York. This sample consisted of low-ability Negro students; Wilson lacked sufficient representation of such students in his sample to test them under varying school conditions. The Commission staff controlled social class of students and found: "... The achievement of disadvantaged Negro students in the lowest achieving schools increases in majority-white classrooms. The trend grows stronger as the average achievement level of the school rises."[79] The logic of this conclusion can be better understood, perhaps, if the reader reviews the findings of McPartland and York (see page preceding).

Undoubtedly, at least some of 26 studies of achievement under conditions of interraciality reviewed so far in this chapter have involved desegregation. Since, however, the time when interraciality began is not known, it is not possible to speak of a process of desegregation. On the other hand, since interraciality is part of every desegregation experience, some findings respecting it may be applied to desegregation.

The 23 studies with clearly-reported comparative results showed that achievement of black students in interracial sc[illegible]nd/or classrooms:

- Rose in 12 studies
- Was mixed in four studies
- Had no effect in seven studies

In addition, analysis of achievement by classrooms rather than schools was found to be a more reliable way of testing the achievement effect of interraciality. In the three studies that explicitly examined the role of ability grouping, the achievement effect of the practice was found to have a moderately to exceedingly negative impact.

THE ROLE OF TRANSPORTATION

Before examining studies of desegregation, it will be useful to analyze the bearing of student transportation on desegregation. Mandatory busing for segregation was a standard practice throughout the South until well into the 1960's. By the early 1970's, as noted in chapter 2, more students were transported to school by a motor-powered vehicle (57.5 percent) than by walking and/or bicycle-riding (42.5 percent). Prior to the emergence of desegregation as a prime public issue, the possible educational consequences of student transportation were rarely investigated. Transportation of children for segregation was not undertaken for an educational, but for a political, purpose.

Nevertheless, full-scale studies have been made of the educational consequences of student transportation without any reference to race. These studies—in West Virginia, Florida, and Oklahoma—concerned transportation as such.

Straley compared 348 transported with 256 nontransported seniors in five West Virginia high schools. Achievement test scores were significantly higher for nontransported students; the difference was greater for boys than for girls. (Academic grades were the same for both transported and nontransported groups.) When Straley matched students in both groups by IQ and sex, the difference was reduced but still significant; for girls, however, the difference was not significant. To get at the reason for this overall difference between groups, Straley checked on any relationship between academic achievement and distance transported. There was no relationship;[80] Straley could not explain the achievement difference.

Davies, in a study of a school in Volusia County, Fl., analyzed the achievement records of 55 pairs of transported and nontransported elementary students. A mathematics achievement advantage in favor of nontransported students was observed; none was found in other subject areas.[81]

White studied 240 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in an urban area. Half were transported. Caucasians accounted for 98 percent of the entire group. In no area of achievement measured by the tests was there a significant difference between transported and nontransported students.[82]

A fourth study, by Dunlop and associates, found statistically significant achievement differences in favor of a nontransported group of second graders. No difference, however, was found for fourth and sixth graders.[83]

In summary, the few transportation studies unrelated to desegration show a somewhat negative achievement effect on transported children. The tendency is uneven, applying to some children in a school and not to others in the same school. It varies according to sex. In estimating the educational consequences of transportation for desegregation, it would be necessary to avoid attributing to desegregation what, in fact, is peculiar to transportation as such.

Similarly, a question has been raised as to the distinctive educational effects of "mandatory massive busing for purposes of improving student achievement. . . ."[84] The literature is bare of any study either of massive v. nonmassive busing, or of mandatory as opposed to nonmandatory busing. The largest scale historical example of mandatory massive busing was the compulsory transportation of black and white children to segregated schools. No study of the educational consequences of that experience has been made. In addition, there is no reason, in present research findings, to believe that achievement effects of desegregation vary with the specific techniques whereby desegregation is implemented. Busing children to a newly desegregated school would seemingly have no different educational consequence than creating a desegregated school by redrawing attendance boundaries or by pairing.

As part of a wide range study of southern school districts that desegregated (some with large-scale busing) during 1971-1972, Davis concentrated on the effects of student transportation. ". . . There is no evidence," he concluded, "that busing per se has any negative consequences."[85] Davis also reported that ". . . there is no evidence that attending *one's own* neighborhood school has any effects, positive or negative, on a school's achievement levels or social climate."[86]

Attribution of negative educational effects to mandatory student transportation for desegregation is unwarranted by research evidence thus far available. Claims to the contrary have not been supported by substantive evidence.

ACHIEVEMENT AND DESEGREGATION

No national research study of desegregation effects has ever been made. The nearest to such a study is the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) published late in 1973. While the effort was restricted in aim, it succeeded in accumulating some new knowledge about desegregation. Otherwise, only small-scale studies are available. The major research institutions—universities, foundations, and government—have stayed away from this area of research. The limited accessible studies have necessarily been small-scale since funds were rarely available for large studies.

What, then, is the research record on achievement effects of desegregation?

The ESAP report found that achievement scores of black male high school students who attended schools receiving Federal desegregation aid were one-half grade level higher than their peers in other schools. This was attributed by the researchers to "improvements in the [experimental] schools' racial climate affecting the motivation of these students."[87] Only about half of the between-school variance in achievement was explained by social class factors. Leadership by principals and teachers was found to be very effective in helping white students accept desegregation. "The most effective way, "declare the researchers," is simply to make sure that the school is firmly committed to improved race relations."[88]

Unexpectedly, the researchers discovered the single most effective school factor in improving test performance was the active participation of an audiovisual specialist and the utilization of his services in a meaningful way. (They caution against equating the mere possession of audiovisual equipment with proper use of it.) Following this lead, the researchers guessed it was not the use of the equipment so much as its impact on the racial climate of the school that affected black male achievement.

For black students to like their school had special racial significance, encouraging in its meaning that the school was truly open to them. In such schools, black student achievement was higher. White students, on the other hand, are not as dependent upon the school which, in any event, does not carry the emotional freight it does for blacks.

The ESAP researcher included a special study—by Ruth E. Narot—on a topic rarely investigated, though incessantly discussed i.e., the impact of desegregation upon achievement of white students. She found that white students achieved more in predominantly white than in predominantly black schools. They scored even higher, however, in schools near the midpoint; in so called racially balanced schools.[89] This is illustrated by the following tables, one for 5th graders, the other for 10th graders.[90] "Perhaps the most noteworthy conclusion, writes Narot, "is that any fears that white achievement has suffered because of southern school desegragation are completely unfounded."[91]

Project Concern, a program of voluntary inner-city to suburb desegregation in various places in Connecticut, involves the movement of minority children to the suburbs. Five studies have been made of various components of the project. Wood studied academic achievement of minority students a year later after selecting a sample matched on WISC-Verbal IQ scores. Grades covered were K-5. A summary of the findings for the experimental group follows:[92]

Grades K-1: Achievement in arithmetic, vocabulary, and verbal IQ increased.

Grades 2-3: Total performance on IQ increased significantly.

Grades 4-5: Vocabulary score increased significantly. While gains were not sweeping, the overall direction was clear. Achievement of white children in the receiving schools held up without exception.

Effect of racial composition on achievement of all fifth grade white students and on each sex, separately, student background controlled

(Predicted mean achievement)
(Raw Scores)

	Percent white of school		
Student group	0-04	41-70	71-100
All whites	343	350	344
Males only	319	322	319
Females only	360	366	356
Number of schools	48	122	127

Effect of racial composition on achievement of all 10th grade white students and on each sex, separately, student background controlled

(Predicted mean achievement)
(Raw Scores)

	Percent white of school		
Student group	0-40	41-70	71-100
All whites	288	276	259
Males only	264	266	254
Females only	304	287	264
Number of schools	22	61	77

The Mahans reported on Hartford after 2 years of Project Concern. The experimental youngsters in grades K-three, they stated, "had significantly different (and higher) scores on measures of mental ability and achievement generally."[93] More significant, however, cognitive functioning in general improved among the Negro children. The Mahans explain:

> The direction of this impact is toward greater verbal productivity, increased accuracy in the associative and sorting processes, and an enhanced willingness to take a risk in terms of verbal responses to situations. . . There are indications that there is a tendency toward better understanding of expectations (i.e., better test taking skill), increased self-discipline, and increased ability to evaluate responses in terms of external standards. . .[94]

These outcomes are viewed by the Mahans as evidence of the beneficial effects of environment on learning.

Levy studied the Project Concern experience in Cheshire. Only 25 students were involved, probably all from New Haven. Based on California Achievement Test scores from testing in 1968 and 1969, no significant changes in test means were recorded. On the other hand, over the same 12 months the percent of children scoring above grade level rose from 30 to 52.[95] It is difficult to make much of this preliminary study. A 2-year study of 196 Project Concern children from Hartford was conducted by Aline Mahan.[96] She was especially interested in probing the relationship of social acceptance to achievement. In the suburban schools this relationship was significantly stronger than in the Hartford schools. Placement in a high achieving classroom helps, even if the school is in the inner-city. But, Mahan reported, the effect is even more beneficial if the school is in the suburbs. Samuels studied 138 New Haven Project Concern children and found they gained significantly more in reading than did two comparable groups of students from outside the project.[97] The gain, however, was not strikingly large.

Three studies have been conducted in Florida.

Williams studied desegregation efffects in Brevard County, Fl.[98] At the start of the 1964-65 school year white and Negro students attending segregated high schools took a statewide ninth grade achievement test. In 1965, the white high school was desegregated and a group of Negroes entered that school. In 1967-68, the same students took the 12th-grade achievement test. The desegregated Negro students continued to score lower than their white classmates. However, in five out of six achievement measures, they scored significantly higher than the Negroes who remained in the segregated high school.[99] During 1966-67, Starnes analyzed achievement changes among fourth, sixth, and eighth graders in an urban Northwestern Florida county. After an academic year, black students in desegregated schools achieved significantly more than matched students who remained in segregated schools.[100] Starnes noted that the test-anxiety level of both groups of black students was similar.

In Miami, a public school's research team completed an achievement study comparing changes from 1969-70 to 1970-71. On arithmetic tests, virtually all three ethnic groups–black, Spanish, and "other"–made at least 1 month progress for each month in school. In two of five grades, blacks and "other" progressed at the same rate. In reading, however, all groups were less successful: "other" scored just better than month-for-month; Spanish, almost at that level; and blacks, distinctly under that level. The following table illustrates these trends but on grade-to-grade achievement gains rather than on monthly improvement.[101]

Grade-to-grade achievement gains, Dade County public schools, 1969-70 and 1970-71 (in grade years)

	Arithmetic			Reading		
	Other	Spanish	Black	Other	Spanish	Black
1st to 2nd grade	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	.8	.7
2nd to 3rd grade	1.4	1.3	.9	1.1	.9	.6
3rd to 4th grade	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	.8
4th to 5th grade	1.0	.9	1.0	1.1	1.0	.8
5th to 6th grade	1.5	1.3	.9	1.1	1.0	.8

Meanwhile, the researchers examined scores of black students for grades two, four, and six from another viewpoint. They found that those students who remained in a predominantly black school achieved at a higher level than those who moved to desegregated schools, and that black junior high school students gained in achievement by attending 10 black schools.[102]

Four desegregation studies are available for Michigan.

Katzenmeyer studied the effect of social interaction on achievement of Negro and white pupils in the public schools of Jackson, Mich.[103] He hypothesized that "the measured intelligence of the group of Negro children will be significantly changed as the consequence of school experience which enhances their opportunities for social interaction with the dominant white culture."[104]

All children entering kindergarten in October and November 1957 and 1958 were given a standard intelligence test. Included were 193 Negroes and 1,061 whites. All were retested in second grade during October 1959 and 1960. With the Negroes treated as an experimental group and the whites as a control, the mean IQ scores were as follows:[105]

	1957-58	1959-60
Experimental group	83.06	89.74
Control group	102.04	103.91

The change in means of the experimental group was found to be statistically significant beyond the .001 level. Katzenmeyer concluded that the change was to be explained principally by the social interaction between Negro and white children. In Jackson, he noted, "the great majority of the Negro population is confined to a small area of the city by economic limitations and by discriminatory policies and pressures in the sale of real estate. . . Thus, for most Negro children, entry into the racially mixed public school program represents the beginning of a period of increased social contact."[106] Another part of the explanation, according to Katzenmeyer, is the high per student expenditure in Jackson schools. Presumably, the Negro child, more deprived to begin with, benefited more from the challenge of an adequate educational program.

As a matter of fact, Katzenmeyer claimed less for his study than his data permit. An examination of his statistical findings reveals that 184 of the total Negro sample of 193 were enrolled in six of the city's 16 elementary schools. In these six schools, Negro children constituted 34.1 percent of total enrollment. The remaining nine Negro students of the sample attended five other schools. Five more schools were all white. Rearranging and recalculating data on changes in mean test scores yields the following:[107]

Gain in points on mean test scores

Study Area	Experimental	Control
6 schools with 184 Negro children	6.54	0.05
5 schools with 9 Negro children	8.93	1.14
5 schools with no Negro children	---	2.76

For all practical purposes, the bottom 10 schools can be dropped. If so, then the difference in test means between experimental (Negro) and control (white) is larger than Katzenmeyer reported. Instead of 6.68 vs. 1.87, it becomes 6.54 vs. 0.50. No socioeconomic data are available, but initial mean IQ scores for the three control subgroups were; 98.81, 102.84, and 102.57; for the two experimental subgroups, they were 82.77 and 88.53.[108]

Katzenmeyer concluded: "While the implications of this study point to some of the disadvantages of segregated schools, they suggest that the answer to the equalization of educational opportunities lies only partially in 'integration' per se; they suggest that a problem basic to the school lies in guiding and encouraging the assimilative process."[109] Two observations remain to be noted about Katzenmeyer's procedure. First, the experimental group might have been matched with a control group of Negro children. Second, it would have been instructive to know the color composition of each classroom within the six schools. In this way, the significance of social interaction could have been tested more directly.

Scott found that black children in Grand Rapids who were bused for 2 years registered significantly higher arithmetic gains than did students who were bused for only 1 year; and, in turn, the 1 year bused students gained significantly more than those who were not bused at all. No reading achievement effect was registered for either bused group.[110] One problem with Scott's research, acknowledged by the researcher himself, is the lack of a control group. As a result, the achievement gain (and nongain, for that matter) found in the study might be spurious, since the gaining group may have started off with an initial advantage that was not controlled in the comparison of groups.

Two studies in Ann Arbor failed to find a positive gain in reading achievement after 1 to 3 years of desegregation. Aberdeen noted that a single grade, both in 1965 and 1968, experienced an increase in reading achievement along with greater social acceptance from white classmates. He held, however, that no general conclusion about desegregation and achievement could be derived from his study.[111] In any event, Aberdeen failed to use control groups, thereby making his study even more inconclusive. Carrigan, however, did use a control group and arrived at the same finding of no achievement effect.[112]

The State of New York has been the locale of 14 desegregation studies; in several cases more than one has been made of the same city.

Wolman investigated the educational changes brought on by a transfer of Negro students in New Rochelle.[113]

Half the enrollment in a virtually all-Negro elementary school was transferred to various predominantly white schools. After 1 year, achievement tests were taken by all transferees. Changes in achievement registered by transferees in grades one through five were found to be statistically insignificant. Further analysis was directed at possible social class factors in the situation. Means of the reading scores of Negro transferees and nontransferees were compared with those of the white children in the receiving school; the latter were significantly higher. The whites were socioeconomically comparable with the Negro children; both were fairly low income.

Wolman then analyzed a year's achievement changes among the kindergarten children. Here she found a statistically significant change. Gains of this group exceeded those of the Negro nontransferees and the white receivers. Wolman interpreted the kindergarten experience as another evidence of the importance of early intervention. "We can assume," she wrote, "that exposure to favorable learning circumstances at an early enough age can have a salutary and compensatory effect on the education potential of minority and otherwise deprived children."[114] Unfortunately, no statistical data were presented in the article so that it is not possible to assess fully the research by Wolman.

In New York City, Slone studied the effect of a school pairing on achievement.[115] Negro students in the pairing scored significantly higher on arithmetic achievement tests than did Negro children in a segregated school. No significant differences showed up on any other achievement measures. Paired white children continued to learn at their previous level.

In Syracuse, N.Y., two busing programs were evaluated by the school system. In the first, a group of Negro children were bused from Croton to Edward Smith School. At the end of the school year, white children at Smith showed their customary achievement gain. The bused children failed to gain any more than the children who had remained at Croton.[116] In the second program, students from Croton were bused to Washington Irving School. As in the previous case, white children at the host school continued to improve in reading at their customary rate. The children from Croton, however, gained significantly more than the children who remained in Croton. The 30 bused pupils achieved a mean growth in months of 8.53, double that of the nonbused children, 4.17.[117]

Denmark and associates conducted a study of desegregation in Manhasset, Long Island.[118] In 1965, seven lower class Negro children in grades three to five transferred from a virtually all-Negro school, which was being closed, to two schools attended primarily by white upper middle children. Soon afterward, their achievement rate increased on verbal ability and the achievement gap narrowed in comparison with their white classmates.[119] This held good for both girls and boys. Negro boys in grades one and two also tested much closer to their classmates in verbal ability than in higher grades. The Denmark team drew two conclusions: One, the earlier desegregation occurs, the better; and two, integration and compensatory education work best together. An interesting contrast with Long's study emerges according to Denmark, in that "the Negro and white segregated schools were comparable in staff and equipment."[120] Yet, in Long's study equal school facilities led to no achievement benefit. In Manhasset they did; perhaps because Negro children there were actually desegregated.

In another study, Denmark and Guttentag studied possible achievement effects of nonsegregated preschooling on 4-year-old Negro children. (Apparently, this research also occurred in Manhasset.) Four preschool groups were organized, only one of which was integrated. The 63 experimental subjects scored higher than did 17 children in a control group. "A good, creative, enjoyable learning climate," concluded the researchers, "may be more important than the specific composition of the experience."[121] Denmark conducted a third study of Manhasset in which she repeated the findings she and her colleagues obtained in the earlier work. She now added that heightened social interaction between black and white children seemed to help the former improve their performance on verbal ability tests. In addition, she cautioned that achievement improvements by black children were being hidden by teachers' tendencies to raise their standards for the black newcomers above the lower standards maintained in the formerly all-black school. Thus, children were actually learning more than previously, but they did not receive the satisfaction of recognition of the fact. Denmark warns that "teachers should be alerted to these tendencies and [be] trained to avoid the problems they create."[122]

In Buffalo, N.Y., Banks and Di Pasquale found that Negro pupils achieved significantly more when bused to a predominantly white school than did their peers who remained in the all-Negro school.[123] After making certain undescribed adjustments in the basic data, the researchers reported that in classrooms where racial composition exceeded 30 percent black, achievement equalled that registered in an all-black classroom. Unfortunately, it is not possible to accept or reject this finding without knowing: (1) What was the "correction factor" applied to the unadjusted achievement scores? (2) What were the unadjusted scores? (3) What variables were "corrected for"? (4) What was the socioeconomic status of the white children in predominantly black classrooms? (5) How were the transferred children selected? None of this information is supplied. A possible check on the Buffalo finding would entail studying academic achievement of Negro children in predominantly Negro schools where "reverse open enrollment" has existed over a period of time, such as the Clara Barton School in Rochester.[124]

In another study of Buffalo, Bowman followed the desegregation process in six schools over the period September 1, 1967 to June 1970. This was a voluntary project in which minority students from Buffalo were transported to predominantly white schools in Monroe County. Bowman summarized his findings succinctly:

> ... Disadvantaged Negro pupils in compensatory and integrated classes for the same time showed similar outcomes in scholastic development. Similar pupils enrolled in segregated classes where no major efforts were directed toward remediation, enrichment, or integration were significantly lower than those who had these scholastic experiences.[125]

Also, the sooner students were enrolled in one or another of the productive programs, the more effective was the achievement. Achievement gains were not found to be incompatible with segregation. On the other hand, attendance in enriched classes—i.e., segregated but with a few added elements of curriculum—was not as beneficial as either desegregation or compensatory education—i.e., a comprehensive educational program of remediation. Bowman concluded that educational planners should seek to combine desegregation with compensation as the best overall strategy for educational success.

Graves and Bedell reported on an evaluation of achievement in the White Plains desegregation experience.[126] In 1964, the school board had established a desegregation plan whereby each of the city's 10 elementary schools was to enroll from 10 to 30 percent Negro. A predominantly Negro school was closed and five segregated white schools were balanced. Graves and Bedell made three comparisons: (1) between two groups of white students before and after desegregation; (b) between two groups of inner-city students both before and after desegregation, and (c) another more restricted comparison of inter-city groups based on number of years in racially balanced schools. Stanford achievement tests were used.

Comparison A: The results of tests taken by 150 white students before desegregation occurred were compared with those of 129 other white students taken after desegregation of the same schools. What was the impact of desegregation on academic achievement? None, apparently. In tests on paragraph meaning and word meaning, the 129 made higher scores; in tests on arithmetic reasoning and computation, the 150 were higher. Judged by changes in median test scores, desegregation in White Plains had not interfered with the generally high level of academic achievement by white students.

Comparison B: The scores of 36 children who attended segregated (and now closed) Rochambeau School were compared with those of

33 children who lived in the same area but who had attended racially balanced schools only. In paragraph meaning and arithmetical reasoning, the children from the racially balanced schools gained more. In arithmetic computation, the segregated children gained more. In word meaning, the results were similar. It also was reported that, from 1964 to 1966, a larger percentage of children in racially balanced schools than in segregated schools made as much as a year and a half's academic progress in all four achievement test areas (85 percent vs. 67 percent). It is possible, then, that desegregation benefited these children, even if slightly.

Comparison C: Two groups of inner-city children–one numbering 44 and the other 33–were compared to discover whether children who had attended balanced schools between first and third grades (the 44) achieved more than those who had attended balanced schools only since the start of third grade (the 33). In tests of paragraph meaning, word meaning, and arithmetical reasoning, the former were from 5 to 15 percentage points ahead; on arithmetical computation, both groups had the same percentage rank. Unfortunately, the report did not present statistics to measure the absolute progress of these two groups on any of the four tests. Accordingly, it is not possible to affirm or contradict the statement in the report that the group of 44 "is achieving slightly better."[127]

The White Plains report suffers from several weaknesses. First, no tests of statistical significance are presented so that the reported score differences cannot be properly evaluated. Second, there is reason to doubt that the comparisons are strictly racial. For example, when Rochambeau School was closed in June 1964, its enrollment was 61.7 percent Negro.[128] Thus, a considerable number of white students apparently lived in the attendance area and went to Rochambeau. Indeed, the Graves-Bedell report describes the inner-city sample as "children, *predominantly* Negro, living in the center city. . ."[[illegible]9] Third, as already pointed out in comparison C no conclusion as to student process can be reached because of the absence of data on absoluted test scores. In all, the Graves-Bedell report failed to document adequately the educational value of the White Plains experiment in desegregation. It is equally clear that nothing in the report as written can be said to disprove the value of the White Plains experiment.[130]

Various desegregation arrangements in Rochester, N.Y., were evaluated. As in a previous year, white students in "receiving" schools continued to learn at their customary rate. Within the same school, a significant learning advantage accrued to students in integrated rather than in segregated classes; this finding supported observations of the year before. On the other hand – and contrary to the previous year – integrated classes did not continue to show achievement superiority over segregated classes with a component of compensatory education.[131] Bowman reached the same finding in Buffalo.

A report made a year later, 1970, arrived at the same conclusion. Whether a black child attended a desegregated school near his own neighborhood or whether he was bused to one in the suburbs made no difference in his achievement gain.[132] Thompson and Dyke made a supplementary study of 35 bused children in the Rochester project. Their goal was to test the reliability of teachers' reports of academic progress by the children. They found with reference to statewide achievement norms that none of the children were scoring lower ratings. Teachers had reported that 13 students scored higher achievement. Thompson and Dyke, however, examined actual achievement test scores and found that these students had experienced less than a half-year's growth during the year. Four of the group actually showed decline in scores.[133] This study underlines the need for an independent evaluation of desegregation experience.

Brooks studied the operation of open enrollment in one middle and upper middle class white school in New York City. While every evidence suggested to the researchers that the academic achievement levels of bused children and receiving school did not sag as a result of the program, numerous white parents in the area were convinced of the opposite. Only 95 black children participated in the program in a school with 1,005 white children. Contrary to the finding of Thompson and Dyke in Rochester, Brooks observed that teachers tended to underestimate the academic progress of black children. The following table contrasts children's achievement level as established by (A) test scores and by (B) teachers' judgments:[134]

	On grade level		Above grade level		Below grade level	
	A	B	A	B	A	B
Number of students	28	30	26	16	30	38
Percent	33	36	31	19	36	45

The children themselves had little doubt of the value of the new school. In the researcher's interviews with 20 of them, they expressed the following typical evaluation: "We learn more... most of the time in the other school we do easy phonics, easy math, easy everything....In this school, the teachers know more....We didn't do no work there."[135] (The role of teachers in the receiving school is discussed in detail in chapter 9.)

The achievement effects of desegregation in a small urban area in the New York City metropolitan area were studied by Moreno. Black children who had attended a nonsegregated school since kindergarten had a markedly more favorable attitude toward school than their white peers. Black and white children of the same IQ level scored comparably well in reading tests, regardless of whether they had attended a nonsegregated school since kindergarten or since second grade.[136] One implication of the latter finding is that achievement effects of desegregation may not depend upon the earliest possible but only early attendance in a desegragated school. This would be a slight modification of "the earlier, the better" principle.

In Texas, four studies of desegregation have been done; two relate to a single city.

The comparative academic achievement of 606 Negro and white high school students in Angleton, Tex., after a year of desegregation was analyzed by Bryant.[137] The following table summarizes achievement gains of both groups:[138]

Changes in total scores on the test of academic progress, May 1966-May 1967 by race, sex, and grade

Group	Increase in standard points	Statistical significance
White	2.264	.01
Negro	1.255	.01

Group	Increase in standard points	Statistical significance
White boys	2.487	.01
White girls	2.017	.01
Negro boys	.833	NS*
Negro girls	1.857	.01
White, 9th grade	1.250	.01
White, 10th grade	3.069	.01
White, 11th grade	2.951	.01
Negro, 9th grade	1.091	.05
Negro, 10th grade	1.605	.01
Negro, 11th grade	.885	NS*

*not significant

Bryant observed that he had not controlled for either intelligence or socioeconomic status.[139] Thus, what appear as racial differences are undoubtedly overstated. Negro girls scored not far from the level of white girls. Bryant did not provide achievement scores for Negro and white students for the period prior to desegregation so it is not possible to ascertain whether the rate of achievement increased or declined as a result of desegregation.

Evans studied six desegregated schools in an unnamed city. Black students in nonsegregated schools who scored lowest on a test of mental ability also gained more on achievement than peers in segregated schools. Otherwise, black students in nonsegregated schools did not even match the achievement level of peers in segregated schools. The researcher was struck by the failure of the school system to respond to the new challenge of desegregation:

> New combinations of ethnic and minority group children in classrooms offer teachers and professional opportunities (sic) to foster personal growth of all children. The data ... in the present study do not indicate that these opportunities are being utilized or recognized.[140]

Accordingly, Evans advised treating the data of his study as the setting for, rather than the consequence of, a desegregation program.

During the 1971-72 school year, the elementary schools of Forth Worth were desegregated by Federal court order. Black fifth graders who attended newly desegregated schools achieved significantly more in reading and arithmetic than did their peers in predominantly black neighborhood schools. Black fourth graders showed no achievement advantage. Evans also investigated the achievement record of white students who attended formerly majority black schools in contrast to their peers who continued in neighborhood schools. No difference was found.[141] In a separate report on the 1972-73 school year, Evans again found significantly greater achievement for bused black students than for peers in majority black neighborhood schools. In addition, he found this advantage applied not only to fourth graders but to black children in the third and fifth grades as well.[142]

In California 10 desegregation studies are available; six deal with a single city.

In Sacramento, minority second-through-sixth graders in non-segregated schools registered significantly higher achievement scores on three tests than did children who remained in neighborhood schools. On six other tests there was no significant difference.[143] In a study of Berkeley, Frelow concluded that greater gains among minority students resulted from a desegregation program than from compensatory programs. This was true, even though desegregation was accompanied by a reduction in school services.[144] In another Berkeley study covering achievement changes from May 1970 to May, 1971, black children reached month-for-month gains only in one grade; in the others gains ranged from one-fourth of a month to one-eighth of a month for every month attended. Mexican American children fared somewhat better, although considerably below the record of white children.[145]

San Francisco, in accordance with a Federal court order, desegregated its elementary schools in September 1971. At the end of the first year, achievement posttests were given. There was also available a record of achievement in school zone 1 (the system is divided into six zones) which had desegregated in 1970. Data on busing were also available city-wide and for zone 1. The following table summarizes the 1971-72 changes:[146]

Median grade-equivalent gains, sixth grade

	City-wide		Zone I	
	Reading	Mathematics	Reading	Mathematics
Total Area	.95	.90	.97	1.04
Spanish-speaking	.87	.82	1.26	.70
Other white	1.12	1.00	1.09	1.12
Black	.85	.80	.87	.92
Chinese	1.00	1.03	.99	1.16
Japanese	.95	1.16	.75	1.27
Filipino	.86	.80	.68	.70
Other nonwhite	.66	.86	.95	1.23
Bused	.93	.90	.93	1.03
Nonbused	.98	.91	1.06	1.06

In general, gains were larger in zone 1. The school system attributes them to the preplanning and longer duration of desegregation than in the city as a whole.

The 6-year desegregation experience of Riverside came under more definitive evaluation. A formal analysis was made by Gerard and colleagues.[147] Purl, research director of the city school system, conducted a series of smaller studies.

Berner and Gerard found little evidence that desegregation resulted in increasing achievement in the desegregated schools as a group. The longer children attended desegregated schools (3 years vs. 1 year), the greater the children's proficiency in setting goals for themselves. Much stress was laid on the great variability of learning conditions from one classroom to another. Minority children whose teachers were least likely to discriminate showed larger improvement in goal setting than children with more prejudiced teachers.[148]

A study by Bikson and colleagues found that minority children exhibited no "language deficit" upon entering school. No evidence was found that language development differed among minority and majority groups. Astonishingly, minority children who went through the desegregation experience tended to talk less freely.[149]

Desegregation in the schools as a whole did not stop the trend towards a greater disparity in achievement between Anglo and minority children. Gerard suggested that "the inevitable insidious comparison undoubtedly had deleterious effects on the minority children."[150] He also noted that the relative deterioration occurred in the context of 80 percent white schools, presumably a racial ratio conducive to minority achievement. Over a period of 4 years, it was found that minority students still operated somewhat as outsiders in the classrooms. Since the Gerard group felt that "the social climate of the classroom is the most important determinant of the child's success," noninvolvement in "the work structure of the classroom" led to low achievement by minority children.[151] Acceptance by white children was more likely to lead to higher achievement by minority children, especially the more able ones.

Miller noted in the Riverside study the power of peer acceptance and teacher attitudes to affect minority child achievement. Teachers who deprecated the ability of minority children to learn usually saw these children fall behind their Anglo classmates. Miller also reports some teachers who were low in discrimination engaged in what might be called patronization, although he does not use the expression. In other words, the teachers at first tended to grade minority children "easier."[152] This did not lead to higher achievement; nor did it slow sagging achievement.

Both Gerard and Miller viewed the Riverside experience as desegregation without integration. The advantages of the former materialize only as the school moves toward the latter. They recalled that Riverside desegregation involved one-way busing of some minority students. Perhaps, they speculated, more sweeping measures of desegregation could have led to other outcomes. Their study convinced them that successful desegregation depends more on the creation of beneficial classroom structures than on personality changes in the students.

Purl, research director for the Riverside schools, was more concerned with discovering hinge points for future change than in a global evaluation of the desegregation experience. The following analysis of findings from a compilation of achievement test results for 529 minority students in the first, second, and third grades during 1972-1973 illustrates this interest. (The data were supplied by Purl but the analysis is the writer's.)

In 1972-73 minority students in 19 schools achieved at or above national norms for one or another of the cooperative primary tests which assess achievement in listening, word analysis, mathematics, and reading. Here is a list of the schools with the number of tests minority children grades one to three in each school passed at or above norm:[153]

Schools	Number of Tests
1. Adams	4
2. Scott	8
3. Bryant	1
4. Emerson	1
5. Harrison	7
6. Hawthorne	2
7. Highgrove	1
8. Highland	9
9. Jackson	1
10. Jefferson	14
11. Liberty	5
12. Longfellow	2

Schools	Number of Tests
13. Madison	2
14. Magnolia	1
15. Monroe	4
16. Mountain View	11
17. Palm	12
18. Victoria	5
19. Washington	1
TOTAL	91

Performance on the tests by Mexican American and Negro children was similar, as the following tabulations show:

Number of at-or above-norm tests passed by:

Test	Mexican Americans	Negroes
Listening	17	11
Word analysis	12	9
Mathematics	13	8
Reading	11	10
	53	38

In some instances, the children achieved in the high percentiles. A listing of the number of tests on which the median percentile attained was 50 or higher follows:

Percentile range	Number of tests
50-59	43
60-69	24
70-79	17
80-89	4
90-97	3

How, in the face of the global failure of desegregation to generate across-the-board achievement, did more than a third of the minority students in the first three grades in Riverside achieve at such high levels? A conventional reply might suggest that the high achievers are simply students who came from families of relatively high socioeconomic status. As noted in the preceding two chapters, however, this type of interpretation really explains little. Purl studied the relationship of socioeconomic status to achievement of high scoring minority students. In part, she found the relationship to be positive. At the same time, there were considerable variations of score that had little or nothing to do with socioeconomic position. Purl examined two minorities in four schools and found a negative relationship between socioeconomic position and achievement in several cases. She suggests that her finding "has made competing explanations such as school or teacher level causes more worthy of exploration."[154] This conclusion is consonant with the view of the Gerard group. (See chapter 9 for more detailed discussion of the teacher factor in Riverside's desegregation.)

In a 1970 report on desegregation in Riverside, a number of findings of potential significance were recorded.[155] By 1975, few of these had emerged as characteristic of the experience as a whole. Yet, some retain their potential significance.

Purl studied the development of cognitive skills during the first year of her study. Higher IQ and reading scores in the desegregated sample, she found, were accounted for by increased Anglo scores only.[156] Achievement tended to rise in proportion to the duration of desegregation. While her comment did not bear directly on the measured outcomes, Purl made an interesting observation:

> In tallying the results for the primary grades, the writer was impressed several times to find that groups of integrated pupils achieved at different levels according to the level of the children with whom they were grouped. Children with equal or lower IQ's scored higher on the reading tests when they were scattered severally among the classes in the receiving school, rather than clustered together in one or two groups.[157]

In 1968, Gerard wrote: "A teacher with negative attitudes towards minority children. . .represent(s) (a) severe handicap. . . in the learning process."[158] By 1974, this insight had become central in Gerard's interpretation of the relative lack of achievement effects in Riverside.

Mercer, in 1968, stated that in order to understand failures of desegregation, one would have to examine the frequently overlooked "obstacles to desegregation generated by the values and structures of the school system itself."[159] During the year that followed, one such internally generated obstacle was the persistence, and, in some cases, the worsening of ethnic cleavage in the classroom.

At the University of South Carolina, Klein studied the initial effects of desegregation during an 8-month period in a school in a southern metropolis.[160] Testing occurred at three schools: one recently desegregated, one all-Negro, and the other virtually all-white. Higher scores on mathematics and biology were first registered for Negro children in the desegregated school. When controls for parental occupation, family size, and parental education were applied, this superiority disappeared. Klein concluded that "the integregated school setting is neither educationally deleterious nor educationally beneficial for Negro students, at least over an 8-month period.[161] He observed also: "The academic achievement of matched groups of integrated white and integrated Negro students did not differ significantly... The academic achievement of matched groups of segregated Negro students and integrated white students did not differ significantly."[162] On the basis of these findings, a question can be reasonably raised about the randomness of the sample populations in the study.

Geiger, in another study at the University of South Carolina, reported on a research study done after 1 year of desegregation in a southern city. Instead of tracing the progress of individual children, he was concerned with the effect of racial composition of classes on achievement. He reported that "no significant relations were found between percentage of Negroes in the class and amount of achievement."[163] The results of the study, Geiger observed, "suggest that fears of necessary detrimental effects of desegregation on classroom achievement may not be firmly based."[164]

A positive achievement effect was found in a third study done by Howell at the University of South Carolina. He examined the scores of 883 eighth graders, some of who attended desegregated schools for some time and others who entered such schools during 1970-71. Howell reported that scores of black students increased significantly in reading and arithmetic. In grade equivalents, black students gained .91 and white students, 1.07 on the Iowa tests. As is true of so much related research, the reasons for success in this project were not immediately apparent. Howell, however, did not tarry on the question "It makes little difference whether academic improvement by the students can be attributed primarily to the desegregation of the races; of primary importance is that under a desegregation plan these schools have been able to provide conditions that facilitated academic improvement for all students."[165]

Four studies of achievement are available for North Carolina. An inquiry into desegregation in Chapel Hill, N.C., was conducted by Prichard.[166] He studied student achievement in grades five, seven, and nine and compared this with achievement in a segregated school. Negro achievement during a year of desegregation rose significantly in mathematics at grades five and seven; and for white students, at grade five. Reading scores did not show significant increase. Two separate studies of Goldsboro by King and Mayer and by McCullough registered significant gains on reading and mathematics.[167] During 1969-70, Clark studied 682 sixth graders in New Hanover County. He found no achievement effect of desegregation.[168]

In Illinois, studies of desegregation in Urbana and Evanston have been made. Marcum found that 1 year of a desegregation program in Urbana brought no achievement effect.[169] A 3-year program in Evanston was evaluated by Hsia. On the whole, achievement of black children did not improve significantly. As in the case of Riverside, however, a number of special situations arose which signified academic growth. Fourth-grade students who were bused to school gained significantly over those who walked to a new school. Fifth-grade students who remained in their nonsegregated neighborhood school registered higher gains than students transferred to a new school, regardless of whether they walked or were bused there.[170] All comparisons are especially difficult to make in the Evanston study because socioeconomic data were not used in the analysis. (Such data, however, were collected.) For example, black girls who had always attended predominantly white schools before desegregation experienced a higher rate of learning than white girls. Was this superiority reflective of the black girls' higher socioeconomic position?

Following is a discussion of a series of studies made of individual cities.

Samuels conducted a study in New Albany, Ind., which sought to discover whether school learning proceeded at comparable rates for Negro and white children when children were first desegregated in junior high school and when Negro students in desegregated schools were compared with those in segregated schools.[171] In both cases, Samuels attempted to control variables such as socioeconomic status and intelligence. For nearly all the students involved, the junior high years were their first experience with desegregation.

In the first comparison, Negro and white students were matched, and their academic achievement over 2 years was compared according to achievement test results and classroom grades. The second comparison involved two matched groups of Negro students: one had attended a segregated school; the other, a desegrated school.

Samuels found that after 2 years of desegregation, the achievement gap between Negro and white narrowed significantly. He attributed this improvement directly to desegregation. Samuels found, too, that the Negro children who attended interracial elementary schools started out in first grade achieving at the same level as Negro children did in the segregated school. By third grade, the desegregated Negro children had pulled ahead; this continued into sixth grade. Overall, Samuels observed that "the longer the association between any particular group of white and Negro students, the smaller the differences in academic achievement appear to be. . . and that the Negro students who had been educated in mixed schools achieved as well as and sometimes better than white students in the integrated program."[172]

In Tulsa, Okla., Griffin studied the achievement records of 64 children whose all-black school was closed in 1968 and who thereupon were transferred to a nonsegregated school. They were compared with a matched group in an all-black school. On five of six subtests of the Stanford achievement tests, as well as IQ, the transferred children scored significantly higher than the control group. While the transferred students earned lower grades than children in the control group, they nevertheless had a more positive attitude toward school than the children in the control group.[173]

Moorefield found no achievement effects of desegregation via busing in Kansas City. Mo.[174] The actual extent of desegregation, however, remains to be clarified. Students from 6 predominantly Negro schools were bused to 12 receiving schools. One of the latter – Attucks – had a Negro enrollment of 65.8 percent before busing and 99.3 percent after busing.[175] Another – Pershing – had 35.8 percent before and 42.8 percent after busing. Of the transported, 1,271 students one-fifth – 256 – were bused to Attucks and Pershing.[176] Achievement data are not reported by individual school. Bused children came from families of above average socioeconomic status and/or education.

Hammond, Sawhill, and Williams studied 224 Negro students who participated in a busing program in Seattle.[177] The students were drawn from 10 schools and entered 32 schools. While their attendance records improved sharply in their new schools, their school records, as measured by grades, suffered: ". . . 43 percent of the total group are doing poorer than they did last year, 41 percent are doing the same, and 16 percent are doing better."[178] Because no achievement test scores are reported, however, it is not possible to know whether the absolute achievement of bused children rose or fell.

Anderson studied the effect of desegregation on Negro children in Nashville.[179] A total of 75 Negro fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in five desegregated schools were compared with 75 similar children from three all-Negro schools. The former, who constituted from 8 to 33 percent of enrollment in their schools, had attended desegregated schools for up to 6 years. All children in the sample lived in the same area. Testing took place in May 1963.

Academic achievement was significantly higher in the desegregated than in the segregated schools. Children who entered a desegregated school near the beginning of their school career achieved significantly better than segregated pupils. On the other hand, children who were desegregated only in fifth or sixth grade achieved less than Negro children in the segregated schools. The significance of academic achievement in this research is impossible to gauge, inasmuch as no controls for social class were evident.

In DeKalb County, Ga., Moore found only a minor achievement effect for 353 children.[180]

Savage was interested to discover whether students in Richmond, Va., who transferred from a black junior high to a nonsegregated senior high school would suffer academically. Their progress continued without interruption as compared with a control group in a black high school.[181]

Scudder and Jurs sought to discover whether the black children in four schools desegregated by busing in Denver would bring white achievement down. They did not.[182]

In Philadelphia, a small-scale project increased reading achievement for black students.[183]

First-grade minority children from Newark who participated in a voluntary busing plan to Verona, N.J., scored significantly higher in achievement tests than their peers who remained. Second graders, however, did not register such gains.[184]

Evaluations of two different voluntary busing projects in Boston were made by Teele and Walberg. Teele's sample consisted of 250 black students to be compared with a control group of children who remained in all-black schools. *Operation Exodus,* as the project was known, generated positive achievement effects, according to Teele. The longer students remained in the project, the more likely their reading achievement would improve significantly. Just as important, the same held true for the black child's feeling of being accepted. The two factors of achievement and acceptance were, accordingly to Teele, closely interrelated. "Those planning school integration programs for black children," stresses Teele, "should be at least a concerned party with issues and conditions of emotional and social development as they are with issues of cognitive development."[185] In the evaluation by Walberg, a study was made of the Metropolitan Educational Opportunity Council (METCO) city-suburban voluntary desegregation program. No achievement effect was found.[186] While some technical question has been raised about the adequacy of Walberg's control group—i.e., siblings of METCO students—there is nothing in the evidence to suggest that a more adequate sample would have made much difference.

SUMMARY

Among the studies cited in this chapter, 29 found definite achievement effect by minority students in a desegregated setting; 19 reported no effect. Certain themes recur throughout the research reports. The importance of teacher acceptance of minority students and the positive significance of acceptance by their peers in the classroom are mentioned repeatedly. These themes arose out of the empirical realities of the classroom or school. It is not too long a leap to infer that these factors may have been at work even when those conducting the specific investigation were not aware of them. Another result is worth noting: socioeconomic factors do not overwhelm desegregation effects.

Since researchers can study only that which social practice puts before them, virtually all the cases of desegregation reported in this chapter are essentially token desegregation. Until very recent times, this was the only kind available. Tokenism, by its nature, sets all the personal burdens of desegregation upon the minority child. It also accentuates his or her own awareness of minority status, and it encourages among white students and teachers, at best, a certain paternalism toward the minority child which poorly serves both sides. Tokensim is thus an unfavorable framework for productive desegregation. One may hope that desegregation, as it grows, will exert an increasingly effective force for educational change.

The present generation of Americans has seen the passing of the traditional one-race school. Recent progress in desegregation has brought children together to an unprecedented degree. Under segregation, minority children were not permitted equal opportunities in any meaningful sense. A black-white achievement gap seemed to be a permanent fixture of schools. Research indicates, however, that achievement of minority children usually rises when they learn together with other children. This seems true whether they are brought together as part of a deliberate desegregation process or as a result of nonsegregated housing. The physical means of effecting the sharing of a common facility—busing, for example—has no direct bearing on the achievement of the children involved. School staff and administrators play a crucial role in facilitating the creative process of learning together.

FOOTNOTES

[1] David S. Seeley in U.S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee of Civil Rights, *Guidelines for School Desegregation. Hearing* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 139.

[2] Meger Weinberg, *Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect* (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), p. 29. See also James S. Coleman, *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, unpublished paper read at a conference of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967.

[3] The 1950 column is based on Bureau of the Census data for population by race and enrollment by race and region. The 1972 column is taken from data in tables 1-3.

[4] Thorstein Veblen, "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," p. 33 in *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays* (New York: Viking, 1942).

[5] *Southern School News*, October 1, 1954, p. 13.

[6] *Ibid.*, July, 1956, p. 2.

[7] *Ibid.*, December, 1956, p. 5.

[8] Harold A. Ferguson and Richard L. Plaut, "Talent: To Develop or to Lose," *Educational Record*, April 1954, p. 138.

[9] Jacob Landers, *Higher Horizons Progress Report* (New York: Board of Education, 1963), p. 9.

[10] Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., *Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change* (New York.: HARYOU, 1946), pp. 168-170. This was a test of reading comprehension.

[11] *Jacob Landers, "A Letter to the Editor," Integrated Education*, (Feburay-March 1967), pp. 48-49.

[12] Albert J. Harris and Robert J. Lovinger, *Some Longitudinal Data on I.Q. Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents* (New York: City University of New York, 1967) p. 2.

[13] Howard H. Long, "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status, 1, "*Journal of Negro Education*, IV (1935)

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 551.

[15] Marion Jacob Mayo, "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the *Archives of Psychology*, No. 28, (November 1913) pp. 25 and 45.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[17] Paul A. Witty and A. I. Decker, "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XVIII, (1927).

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 500.

[19] Mary R. Crowley, "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School, " *Journal of Negro Education*, 1 (1932). A critique of this study can be found in Howard Hale Long, "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education*, IV (1935).

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[21] Committee on Race and Education, *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools* (Portland, Oreg. Board of Education, Oct. 29, 1964, p. 113.

[22] Robert L. Crain, "School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes," *Sociology of Education*, 44 (1971), p. 25.

[23] Robert L. Crain and Carol Sachs Weisman, *Discrimination, Personality, and Achievement. A Survey of Northern Blacks* (New York: Seminar Press, 1974) p. 160.

[24] James Arthur Laurent, *Effects of Race and Racial Balance of School on Academic Performance* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969), p. 139. See, also, Laurent, *Do Pupil Race and/or School Racial Balance Affect Academic Performance?* December 1970 (ERIC No. ED 048 393)

[25] Stanley P. Matzen, *The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms* (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

[31] James McPartland, *The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of Ninth Grade Negro Students. Interim Report* (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, September 1967).

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[34] *Ibid.*

[35] Muriel B. Gunthorpe, *A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-8477).

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[39] David Long, *Educational Performance in Integrated and Segregated Elementary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968), p. 57. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10, 982).

[40] *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 85.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[42] Julia R. Vane, "Relation of Early School Achievement to High School Achievement When Race, Intelligence and Socioeconomic Factors are Equated," *Psychology in the Schools*, 3 (1966), 124-129.

[43] Julia R. Vane, Jonathan Weitzman, and Adrian P. Applebaum, "Performance of Negro and White Children and Problem and Nonproblem Children on the Stanford Binet Scale," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22 (1966).

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

[45] See James H. Fortenberry, *The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and non-Mixed Schools,* (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959), (University Microfilms Order No. 59-5492).

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[47] Jane D. Lockwood, *An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools,* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8303).

[48] *Ibid.*, pp. 49-50.

[49] Norma Radin, *A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools in One Community,* Ypsilanti, Mich., Public Schools, April 15, 1966, unpublished.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[51] Telephone discussion with Miss Delores Tripp, School Specialist, Michigan Civil Rights Commission, December 7, 1967.

[52] See Robert A. Dentler, "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," Memorandum No. 5 of the Education Complex Study (New York: Center for Urban Eduction); and California State Department of Education, *Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Part One: Distribution of Pupils,* Fall 1966 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education March 1967.

[53] Ralph Scott, "Social Class, Race, Seriating and Reading Readiness: A Study of Their Relationship at the Kindergarten Level," *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 115 (1969) 87-96.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

[55] Michael Rosenfeld, *Negro-White Differences in Intellectual Growth* (August 30, 1968), p. 6 (ERIC #24 024 073).

[56] Gerald S. Lesser, Kristine M. Rosenthal, Sally E. Polkoff, and Marjorie B. Pfankuch, "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," *Integrated Education,* (June-July 1974)

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[58] *Ibid.*,

[59] Merle H. Elliott and Alden W. Badal, "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research,* September 1965.

[60] Dumbarton Research Council, *An Analysis of Data Concerning Graduates of the Public Schools in Oakland, California. An Interim Report to the U.S. Office of Education.* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Dumbarton Research Council, October 16, 1967) p. 87.

[61] Robert B. Frary and Thomas M. Goolsby, Jr., "Achievement of Integrated and Segregated Negro and White First Graders in a Southern City," *Integrated Education,* 8 (July-August 1970), p. 48.

[62] Thomas M. Goolsby, Jr. and Robert B. Frary, *Enhancement of Educational Effect through Extensive and Intensive Intervention. The Gulfport Project* (Gulfport, Miss.: Gulfport Municipal Separate School District, July 1969), pp. 41 and 56.

[63] Frary and Goolsy, "Achievement and Integrated and Segregated Negro and White First Graders in a Southern City," p. 50.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[65] Edgar G. Epps, *Family and Achievement: A Study of the Relation of Family Background to Achievement Orientation and performance Among Urban Negro High School Students* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, February 1969), p. 98.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 118.

[67] See Nancy St. John, *School Integration, Classroom Climate and Achievement,* January 1971 (ERIC No. ED 052 269).

[68] Nancy St. John and Ralph Lewis, *The Influence of School Racial Context on Academic Achievement,* April 1971, p. 8. (Later published in *Social Problems,* Summer 1971).

[69] James S. Coleman, Ernest Q. Campbell, Harold J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederick D. Weinfeld, and Robert L. York, *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 307 and 331.

[70] See Appendix C1, "Further Analysis of Equality of Educational Oportunity," in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 35-142.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[74] See Appendix C3, "Educational Consequences of Segregation in a California Community," in *ibid.*, II, pp. 165-206.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[77] This criticism as well as others are made in Thomas F. Pettigrew, *The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's cities sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967, pp. 9-11.

[78] *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* I, pp. 98-99.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 102

[80] Harry Goff Straley, *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement and Social Adjustment of Transported and Non-Transported High School Seniors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1956), p. 130.

[81] Ernest A. Davies, Jr., *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Tranported and Non-Transported Pupils at Holly Hill Elementary School, Holly Hill, Florida* (Master's thesis, Stetson University, 1969), p. 36.

[82] See Danny Allen White, *The Effects of Public School Transportation Upon the Overall School Adjustment of Urban Elementary School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970) and Dan A. White, "Effects of Busing on Urban School Students," *Educational Leadership,* 29 (1971), pp. 255-257.

[83] G. M. Dunlop, R. J. C. Harper and S. Hurka, "The Influence of Transportating Children to Centralized Schools Upon Achievement and Attendance," *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 44 (July,

1958), pp. 191-198 quoted in White, *The Effects of Public School Transportation Upon the Overall School Adjustment of Urban Elementary School Students*, p. 46.

[84] David J. Armor, "The Evidence on Busing," *Public Interest*, No. 28 (Summer 1972), pp. 115-116.

[85] James A. Davis, "Busing," p. 118 in Robert L. Crain (ed.), *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation*, October 1973 (ERIC No. ED 084 426).

[86] *Ibid.* (emphasis in original)

[87] Crain, (ed.), *Southern Schools*, I, P. iv.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[89] *Ibid.*, II, p. 73.

[90] *Ibid.*, pp. 74 and 77.

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[92] Bruce Hartley Wood, *The Effects of Busing Versus Non-Busing on the Intellectual Functioning of Inner City, Disadvantaged Elementary School Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1969, pp. 60-66. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5186).

[93] Aline M. Mahan and Thomas W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children," *Integrated Education*, 8 (1970), 60.

[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61.

[95] Marilyn Levy, "Project Concern in Cheshire. A Preliminary Report" (Cheshire, Conn.: Department of Education, January 1970), reported in U.S. Congress, 91st, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Opportunity. Hearings. . . ,* Part 1B–*Equality of Educational Opportunity. Appendix* (Wash. D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 590-598.

[96] Aline Mattson Mahan, *Social Factors and the Academic Success of Urban Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1969).

[97] See Joseph Maurice Samuels, *A Comparison of Projects Representative of Compensatory; Busing; and Non-Compensatory Programs for Innter-City Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1971) and "Busing, Reading, and Self in New Haven," *Integrated Education*, 10 (November-December 1972), pp. 23-28.

[98] Frank E. Williams, *An Analysis of Some Differences Between Negro High School Seniors From a Segregated High School and a Nonsegregated High School in Brevard County, Florida* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 69-16,050).

[99] *Ibid.*, pp. 44-53.

[100] Thomas Albert Starnes, *An Analysis of the Academic Achievement of Negro Students in the Predominantly White Schools of a Selected Florida County* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Missiissippi, 1968), p. 26.

[101] Derived from basic data in *Evaluation of Desegregation 1970-71* (Miami, Florida: Dade County Public Schools, June 1972), p. 25.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[103] See William G. Katzenmeyer, *Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2227).

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[105] *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 56-59.

[108] See table in *ibid.*, p. 57.

[109] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[110] Wayne Scott, *A Study of Bused and Non-Bused Children* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Grand Rapids Public Schools, June 1970), p. 3.

[111] Frank David Aberdeen, *Adjustment to Desegregation: A Description of Some Differences Among Negro Elementary School Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 72.

[112] Patricia Corrigan & David Aberdeen, *Some Early Effects of Compulsory Desegregation on Elementary School Children*, March 1970 (ERIC No. ED 038 658).

[113] T. G. Wolman, "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," *Integrated Education*, (December 1964-January 1965).

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[115] Irene Wholl Slone, *The Effects of One School Pairing on Pupil Achievement, Anxieties, and Attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 808).

[116] Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, N.Y., "Study of the Effect of Integration–Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School Pupils," pp. 327-328 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

[117] Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, N.Y., "Study of the Effect of Integration–Washington Irving and Host Pupils," pp. 323-326 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester, New York, September 16-17, 1966* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[118] Florence L. Denmark, Marcia Guttentag, and Robert Riley, *Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms and Pre-Integration Subject Variables as They Affect the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Previously Segregated Children*, August 1967. (ERIC #ED 016 721).

[119] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[120] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[121] Florence L. Denmark and Marcia Guttentag, "Effect of Integrated and Non-Integrated Programs on Cognitive Change in Pre-School Children," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 29 (1969), 379.

[122] Florence L. Denmark, "The Effect of Integration on Academic Achievement and Self-Concept," *Integrated Education*, 8 (May-June 1970), p. 41.

[123] Ronald Banks and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale, *A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration* (New York: Buffalo Public Schools, January 1969), p. 1.

[124] See Herman R. Goldberg, John H. Griffith, Russell F. Green, and Orrin H. Bowman, *An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education* (Rochester, N.Y.: Board of Education, July 1969), p. 6.

[125] Orrin H. Bowman, *Scholastic Development of Disadvantaged Negro Pupils; A Study of Pupils in Selected Segregated and Desegregated Elementary Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973), p. 85.

[126] Marian F. Graves and Frederick D. Bedell, *A Three Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan* (White Plains, N.Y.: Board of Education, October 16, 1967) (Hereinafter cited as *A Three Year Evaluation.*)

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[128] White Plains Public Schools, "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Per Cent Negro." August 30 1967.

[129] *A Three Year Evaluation*, p. 3 (emphasis added).

[130] For an account of such an (invalid) charge made by local critics of White Plains desegregation, see *New York Times*, November 10, 1967.

[131] Herman R. Goldberg, John H. Griffin, Russell F. Green, and Orrin H. Bowman, *An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education* (Rochester, N.Y.: Board of Education, July 1969), pp. 29-30.

[132] See *A Three Year Longitudinal Study to Assess A Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education for Elementary Level Pupils* (Rochester, N.Y.: Rochester City School Distrcit, September 1970) (ERIC NO. ED 048 428).

[133] Carolyn E. Thompson and Frances L. Dyke, *First Interim Evaluation Report: Urban-Suburban Pupil Transfer Program* 1971-1972 (Rochester, N.Y.: City School District, August, 1972), p. 46.

[134] Bernice Demsky Brooks, *A Study of Ninety-Five Children Traveling by Bus to a K-5 School as Part of the Open Enrollment Program in a Large Urban School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1969), p. 55.

[135] *Ibid.*, pp. 95-97.

[136] Marguerite Cusack Moreno, *The Effect of Integration on the Aptitude, Achievement, Attitude to School and Class, and Social Acceptance of Negro and White Pupils in a Small Urban School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1972), p. 76.

[137] James Chester Bryant, *Some Effects of Racial Integration of High School Students on Standardized Achievement Test Scores, Teacher Grades, and Drop-out Rates in Angleton, Texas* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1968). (University Microfilms Order No. 69-768)

[138] *Ibid.*, 65, 69.

[139] *Ibid.*, 57-58.

[140] Charles Lee Evans, *The Immediate Effects of Classroom Integration on the Academic Progress, Self-Concept, and Racial Attitude of Negro Elementary Children* (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1969), p. 84.

[141] Charles Lee Evans, *Short-Term Desegregation Effects: The Academic Achievement of Bused Students, 1971-1972* (Fort Worth, Texas: Fort Worth Independent School District, January 1973), p. 23.

[142] Charles Lee Evans, *Integration Evaluation* (Fort Worth Texas: Fort Worth Independent School District, August 15, 1973), p. 2.

[143] Marshall Smith, Elizabeth L. Useem, Clarence Normand, and Thomas F. Pettigrew, "A Critique of "The Evidence on Busing," p. 31.

[144] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[145] See Arthur D. Dambacher, *Report of Group Achievement Tests for 1970-1971* (Berkeley, Calif.: Berkely Unified District, (1971).

[146] *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation Data from Integration* 1971-72 (San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972), pp. 36, 38, 56, and 58.

[147] The following discussion is based on a series of drafts of separate articles, kindly supplied by Professor Harold B. Gerard. As a group these are to be published in a special number of *Journal of Social Issues*, under the editorship of Professor Gerard. Since the published versions of the articles may well differ from the drafts, only minimal quotations are provided.

[148] Lois Biener and Harold B. Gerard "Effects of Desegregation on Achievement Relevant Motivation," unpublished.

[149] Kay Bikson, Michel Thelia, Harold B. Gerard and Erhan Yasar, "School Desegregation and Children's Speech Properties," unpublished.

[150] Harold B. Gerard, Harry Singer, and David Refern, "Desegregation and the Achievement of White, Black and Mexican American Pupils," pp. 18-19, unpublished.

[151] Harold B. Gerard, Terrence D. Jackson, and Edward S. Connolley, "Social Contact in the Desegregated Classroom," pp. 2 and 11, unpublished.

[152] Norman Miller, "Riverside School Study: Summary and Conclusions," p. 24, unpublished. See, also, Norman B. Henderson, Barbara Goffeney, Bruce V. Butler, and Quentin D. Clarkson, "Differential Rates of School Promotion from First Grade for White and Negro Male and Female 7-Year Olds," *Psychology in the Schools*, 8 (1971), pp. 101-109.

[153] See tabular materials released by Riverside Unified School District, August 1973: "Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 12A, Administered May 1973, Grade One;" Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 23A, and Large-Thorndike Intelligence Test, Primary Battery, Level 2, Form A, Administered, May 1973"; and "Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 23B, Administered May 1973.

[154] Mabel C. Purl with Adrian E. Lindell, *The Relationship of SES to Higher Achieving Minority Pupils* (Riverside, Calif.: Riverside Unified School District, July 1974), p. 1. See, also, Tom Wicker, "Integration and Innovation," *New York Times*, April 2, 1974.

[155] Meyer Weinberg, *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal*, 2nd edition, (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970), chapter 5.

[156] Mabel C. Purl, *Progress Report* (Riverside, Calif.: Riverside School Study, October 15, 1968), p. 4.

[157] *Ibid.*, p. 21. See, also, Wicker, "Integration and Innovation."

[158] Harold B. Gerard and Bertram H. Raven, *Intervention Programs to Overcome Psycho-Social Deficits* (Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968, p. 5.

[159] Jane R. Mercer, "Issues and Dilemmas in School Desegregation: A Case Study," *Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems Proceedings*, 1968, p. 7 (reprint).

[160] Robert Stanley Klein, *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Negro 10th Grade High School Students Attending Segregated and Recently Integrated Schools in a Metropolitan Area of the South* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 565).

[161] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[162] *Ibid.*

[163] Otis Glenn Geiger, *Effects of Desegregation on Classroom Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968). p. 27. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5796).

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[165] William Lawrence Howell III, *The Correlates of Change in School Integration With the Academic Achievement of Eighth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1972), p. 48.

[166] Paul N. Prichard, "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," *Integrated Education*, 7 (1969) 33-37.

[167] Smith, Useem, Normand, & Pettigrew, "A Critique of 'the Evidence on Busing,'" p. 28.

[168] El Nadal Clark, *Analysis of the Differences Between Pre- and Post-Test Scores (Change Scores) on Measures of Self-Concept Academic Aptitude, and Reading Achievement Earned by Six Grade Students Attending Segregated and Desegregated Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1971), p. 71.

[169] Roger Brasel Marcum, *An Exploration of the First-Year Effects of Racial Integration of the Elementary Schools in a Unit School District* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968), p. 114.

[170] Jayjia Hsia, *Integration in Evanston*, 1967-71: A *Longitudinal Evaluation* (Evanston, Ill.: Educational Testing Service, August 1971), p. 40. For a negative evaluation, see Harold Kurtz, "An Independent Assessment of 'Integration in Evanston, 1967-1971: A Longitudinal Evaluation: A Report on the Educational Consequences of Desegregation in District 65 of Evanston, Illinois,'" pp. 1436-1443 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing Hearings...*, Part 3 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972).

[171] See Ivan G. Samuels, *Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement*, (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958) (University Microfilms Order No. 58-2934).

[172] *Ibid.* p. 100.

[173] Jack Leo Griffin, *The Effects of Integration on Academic Aptitude, Classroom Achievement, Self-Concept, and Attitudes Toward the School Environment of A Selected Group of Negro Students in Tusla, Oklahoma* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1969), p. 73.

[174] Thomas Earl Moorfield, *The Busing of Minority Group Children in a Big City School System* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967), pp. 145-147.

[175] See table 2, *ibid.*, p. 25.

[176] See table 1, *ibid.*, p. 22.

[177] Alpha J. Hammond, Lucy M. Sawhill, and Robert B. Williams, *A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Rulings* (Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1964).

[178] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[179] Louis V. Anderson, *The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children* (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-11, 237).

[180] Louis Moore, *The Relationship of Selected Pupil and School Variables and the Reading Achievement of Third-Year Primary Pupils in a Desegregated School Setting* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1971), p. 95.

[181] LeMoyne W. Savage, *Academic Achievement of Black Students Transferring from a Segregated Junior High School to an Integrated High School* (Master's thesis, Virginia State College, July 1971), p. 49.

[182] Bonnie Todd Scudder and Stephen G. Jurs, "Do Bused Negro Children Affect Achievement of Non-Negro Children, "*Integrated Education*, 9 (March-April 1971), p. 34.

[183] Smith, Useem, Normand, and Pettigrew, "A Critique of 'The Evidence on Busing,'" p. 29. For a personal statement on—despite the title—the learning value of desegregation, see William Vernon Lee, "Each Year I AM Learning Less and Less,'" *Integrated Education*, 12 (January-April 1974), p. 29.

[184] Stanley M. Zdep, "Educating Disadvantaged Urban Children in Suburban Schools: An Evaluation, " *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1 (1971), p. 180.

[185] James E. Teele, *Evaluating School Busing. Case Study of Boston's Operation Exodus* (New York: Praeger, 1973), p. 119.

[186] Herbert J. Walberg, *An Evaluation of an Urban Suburban School Busing Program: Student Achievement and Perception of Class Learning Environment*, February 1971 (ERIC NO. ED 047 076).

CHAPTER 7

BEING BLACK AND ONESELF

Frederick Douglass, fugitive slave and black abolitionist, wrote his first autobiography in 1845, the fifth year of his freedom. One skeptic charged that Douglass had not written the book. A. C. C. Thompson, the critic, declared he had observed Douglass as a compliant slave and that he was incapable of composing a book. Douglass wrote a reply and sent it to his friend, William Lloyd Garrison, who printed it in the *Liberator*. In his characteristic devotion to the truth, Douglass tried to explain his own case through the eyes of the critic:

> The degradation to which I was then subjected, as I now look back at it, seems more like a dream than a horrible reality. I can scarcely realize how I ever passed through it, without quite losing all my moral and intellectual energies. I can easily understand that you sincerely doubt if I wrote the narrative; for if any one had told me, seven years ago, I should ever be able to write such an one, I should have doubted as strongly as you now do. You must not judge me now by what I was—a change of circumstances has made a surprising change in me. Frederick Douglass, the *freeman*, is a very different person from Frederick Bailey, the *slave*. I feel myself almost a new man—freedom has given me new life.[1]

Outwardly, as a slave, Douglass was obedient, hard working, and true to inherited station in life. Somehow, he conserved his "moral and intellectual energies" and endured. Within a few years, he revolutionized his life. Freedom, unlike slavery, enabled Douglass to flower far beyond the bounds of conventional conceptions of a slave. Immediately upon touching northern soil, he turned to the task of helping abolish slavery.

During the Civil War, numerous slaves were similarly transformed, although few became renowned writers and organizers. Known in bondage as compliant laborers, when placed in battle against their former masters, they held their ground and fought well. They were not long deterred by lingering memories of obedience. After the war, as indicated in chapter 1, the freedmen sought education for their children as well as for themselves. No longer forbidden to learn to read or write, blacks availed themselves of existing schools. There was no need for compulsory attendance laws in these circumstances.

At the heart of expanded black schooling was a highly favorable concurrence of events. Black children entered schools in large numbers. At the same time, they could see their parents sharing political power, occupying governmental offices, and exercising civil rights to an unprecedented degree. For about a decade or so after the Civil War, freedom of black people was palpable. In addition, black communities refreshed collective memories by celebrating emancipation with stories of black combat bravery during the war. All in all, the rising aspirations of black children were confirmed by the evidence of daily events.

The advent of planned deprivation and segregation of black school children, however, introduced a much different course of events. Severely restricted opportunities were matched by the imposition of caste schooling which prepared black children to perform menial jobs for the most part. Doctrines of racial inferiority took their toll as black children were taught to regard themselves as less deserving of opportunities to grow and to learn. Inferiority was the preachment of the dominant white community but its effectiveness varied.

In Mississippi, early in the present century, the McAllisters lived in and around Vicksburg. One of the daughters recalled her family, 70 years later:

> They performed the miracle: They insulated me. But I was not overprotected, I was never subject to great disillusionment when I left that close-knit community. When later we learned that Negroes weren't expected to do anything, or accomplish anything, we knew deep down that we *could* do it all. We had been carefully prepared.[2]

She later became the first black woman in the United States to earn an academic doctorate and spent nearly a half-century teaching in black colleges.

Richard Wright grew up in Mississippi around the same time. His experiences as a black child were far harsher than those of the McAllister children. He wondered how other black youth seemingly came to accept the restricted life chances that were their lot: "I began to marvel at how smoothly the black boys acted out the roles that the white race had mapped out for them . . . Although they lived in an America where in theory there existed equality of opportunity, they knew unerringly what to aspire to and what not to aspire to."[3] Whether out of prudence or conviction, it was in either event safer for Mississippi blacks to moderate their aspirations. Yet, Wright refused for long to do this. Somewhat in the manner of Douglass, Wright speculated: "What was it that made me conscious of possibilities? From where in this southern darkness had I caught a sense of freedom? . . . How dare I consider my feelings superior to the gross environment that sought to claim me?"[4]

Only human beings can hope or despair. All children face a life challenge of shaping a future for themselves. The degree to which they can lay hold of the future depends on the shape of their present world. This includes not only their innermost strivings, but also the character of family, community, and national forces. For black children, these latter forces are complicated by the profound racist character of American institutions, including education.

The achievements of Douglass, McAllister, and Wright cannot be understood without close attention being paid their social circumstances. This is even truer of countless anonymous black persons. Most astonishing perhaps is the fact that even adversities so serious as slavery did not transform the oppressed into nonhuman work machines. ". . . No word that I had ever heard fall from the lips of southern white men," wrote Wright defiantly, "had ever made me really doubt the worth of my own humanity . . . "[5] To endure oppression required more than remaining alive; it also challenged the capacity of the oppressed to maintain their own individuality and self-respect.[6]

Black aspirations and achievement thrived most when blacks played a major role in ridding themselves of oppressive social practices. The two periods of greatest black achievement in American education were also the times of heightened black self-consciousness and organized political social action. These were the Reconstruction period following the Civil War and the present. Both times saw a black-led movement initiate reforms in American national life that forced educational institutions to share, however reluctantly, in the reallocation of educational opportunities. The impact of these events upon the aspirations and self-concepts of black children was immense.

Social science researchers, however, have all but ignored the influence of such broad factors upon black or any other children. Many researchers conduct endless studies of contrasts between black and white achievement and aspirations which are presumed to operate in a narrow world of isolated elements such as parental occupation, hue of skin, age of children, and the like. Reference is rarely made to the enveloping social system and its role in determining achievement and aspirations. As Welsing writes: ". . . White supremacy . . . mean[s] . . . that whites will function in a superior way as compared to all non-whites . . . A racist social system . . . must, for its maintenance, produce differential levels of functioning for whites and for non-whites."[7] This insight suggests the active role of schools in reproducing racism. Few researchers have followed the lead.

The significance of race is frequently misconceived in social science research on aspirations and self-concept. Edwards contends that researchers employ a model of black people that is hardly more than a common stereotype. Research findings that contradict the stereotype are ignored "in a process of selective perception caused mainly by racist cultural biases. . ."[8] Similarly, Jackson asserts that "most Americans rarely conceptualize *blacks*. But they know *the black*."[9] In this manner, social-psychological characterizations of blacks are made with exceedingly slender evidence, on the assumption that all blacks are basically the same. At other times, interpretations of black behavior are made through gratuitous assumptions by the researchers. Thus, in one of the best studies of its kind, Rosenberg and Simmons held that black children growing up in segregated conditions were basically unaware of the low status of blacks in the community at large; accordingly, their self-esteem—which was found to be high—was said to rest on a misconception.[10] Buck objects to this reasoning and offers an alternate explanation of high self-esteem of black youngsters under segregation. She proposes that young blacks are quite aware of their low social status. Their parents or other significant persons, however, make efforts to counter the effect of such awareness by propping up the self-respect of the young people. Buck suggests that "black parents are forced to over-indoctrinate their children with ideas of self-confidence and self-worth which results in their children being able to articulate the responses suggesting high self-esteem. . ."[11] Such an approach seems preferable to that of Rosenberg and Simmons for it seems more rooted in the actualities of black family life. In addition, it pays young people the compliment of acknowledging their sensitivity to segregation, one of the most profound forces in their life.

Since the early 1960's there has been a great increase in the number of studies of self-concept. Many of these studies are weak. As Christmas observes:[12]

> In general, they contain unclear terms and poorly defined concepts. Constructs such as self-esteem, self-regard, and self-attitudes are used as if synonymous with each other and with self-concept. Selected inclusively rather than exclusively, they reflect a range of ideas often incompletely interrelated and lacking in theoretical formulation.[12]

Wylie, who in 1961 wrote the leading evaluation of self-concept studies, reviewed the situation in 1974. Her criticisms were consistent with those of Christmas. Among other shortcomings, she stressed that most studies were "one-shot affairs", often using a test drawn up by the researcher for the occasion and never used again. Wylie even questioned the validity of the most frequently used self-concept tests.[13]

Despite these criticisms, it would be rash to reject existing research on methodological grounds alone. The majority of such criticisms are themselves subject to the fault of insularity. That is, they assume that reliable knowledge of self-concept can emerge from investigations based solely on psychological methods. Unfortunately, even the finest honed tools of psychology ignore vast areas of human action. This includes considerations of history and social structure, for example. At this point the best course is to use available psychological tools and "check out" the findings against insights provided by historical and sociological research.

A generation ago, the subject of black self-concept was all but unacknowledged. Since the rise of the civil rights movement and the world-wide drive for universal human rights, interest in the subject has grown rapidly. The new interest is as much political as psychological. While the varieties of politics seem endless, certain central themes have emerged. None seems more significant then those found in the writings of Frantz Fanon, black psychiatrist from Martinique who ended his days serving the Algerian revolution for independence from France.

Fanon advocated "nothing short of the liberation of the man of color from himself."[14] He fought any tendency to regard a person's skin color—black or white—as a flaw. Racial oppression of blacks, he contended, did not result from the mere fact that they lived among whites. Rather, the so-called Negro problem resolved itself into a problem of blacks "exploited, enslaved, despised by a colonialist, capitalist society that is only accidentally white."[15] It was not the whiteness of white society that resulted in oppression but rather the dynamics of that society. Implicitly, held Fanon, a black society constructed along the same lines would also produce oppression of blacks.

Fanon was aggrieved by the fate of black children in a racially oppressive society. The child from its earliest years was turned into an inferior, yearning to be white. "A normal Negro child, having grown up within a normal family," declared Fanon, "will become abnormal on the slightest contact with the white world."[16] He saw the elementary schools as prime places for the alienation of black children from themselves. He proposed a concrete remedy:

> . . . I should like nothing more nor less than the establishment of children's magazines especially for Negroes, the creation of songs for Negro children, and, ultimately, the publication of history texts especially for them, at least through the grammar school grades. For, until there is evidence to the contrary, I believe that if there is a traumatism, it occurs during those years.[17]

More generally, he defended the right of black people to be black. But this status was regarded as part of a universal right to be human. As Fanon phrased it: ". . . I have one right alone: That of demanding human behavior from the other."[18]

In recent years, Fanon's themes have concerned increasing numbers of researchers. While he himself regarded the social revolutionary aspect of his thought as indispensable, most researchers have separated this aspect from the rest of his writings. More attention is being paid to the impact of racism on the black child's self-concept, the development of racial self-acceptance, the organization of black studies in one form or another, and tensions between black consciousness and the universality of human rights. The title of Fanon's first book was *Black Skin, White Masks*. It might also be a good description of recent empirical research in the area of black self-concept.

ASPIRATIONS

In 1963, the Ausubels reported that research indicated Negro youths had low academic and vocational aspirations resulting from their depressed social and personal condition.[19] Some 4 years later, Coleman noted evidence of "a peculiar and ill-understood phenomenon that appears to characterize many Negroes, adults and youth; a high, unrealistic, idealized aspiration, relatively unconnected to those actions that ordinarily lead to achievement of a goal."[20] It would be difficult to imagine a highly motivated student who also had minimal aspirations for a better future. This is not to say, however, that past failures of black youth to achieve reflects low aspirations.

In the past, what appeared to be low aspirations by Negro youth sometimes turned out to be quite something else. As Logan reported in 1933:

> In the Boston public school system a few white teachers, who hardly act on their own initiative, are becoming increasingly bolder in their efforts to discourage colored students from going to the college preparatory high schools and to white colleges. In one school, a separate assembly of colored students was ordered for the purpose of extolling to them the virtues of manual training and of colored schools.[21]

Boston was not unusual in this regard.

Instead of asking: "Do black youth aspire high enough?" it might be more relevant to inquire: "Do high-aspiring black youth find avenues open that permit high achievement?" Epps, who has researched high aspirations extensively, characterizes them as possibly transitory or fantasy-like. On the other hand, actual opportunities to attain or achieve are more stable and consequential. In studying aspirations, attention must be paid to the actual availability of various employments. The search for psychological predispositions of achievement has probably been overdone.

In two separate studies by Ogbu and Turner (see chapter 5, pages 68-69) vocational aspiration thinking of black children was observed as dominated by the actual distribution of occupations rather than by the character of occupation attitudes learned in the home. In a large-scale study of 5,000 poor American families Morgan and associates found, for example, that "the chances of a white family being persistently poor are very small if the head has a high school education, but this is not true for a black family."[22] The researchers reported "We have not been able to find much evidence that people's attitudes or behavior patterns affect the trends in their well-being."[23] In Riverside, Calif., a long-term study by Miller concluded that "the beneficial scholastic effects of desegregation are more likely to stem from situational and social characteristics of the educational setting than from personality changes that might ensue from integration."[24]

Income and occupational trends over the 1960's were beneficial to blacks. In Brimmer's summary, developments during the decade showed that "younger blacks are making substantial progress in achieving secondary and higher education, and this increased education is yielding higher incomes both absolutely and relative to whites."[25] The narrowing of black-white educational differences helped rectify somewhat the distribution of jobs between the races. Blacks who completed 4 years of college were the greatest gainers; indeed, by the end of the 1960's they could be said to be "overrepresented" in the professions.[26] This undoubted progress obscured persistent poverty among blacks in the central cities. During the 1960's, unemployment among black teenagers averaged more than 21.3 percent.[27] Young men and women in urban areas received little relief from government or private agencies.[28] Meanwhile, thousands of black students in the cities were enrolled in "general" high school curriculums which one critic called "the main dumping ground . . . which does not prepare its graduates either for work or college . . ."[29] The principal of a black high school in Memphis declared: "They have diplomas, but no jobs."[30]

STUDIES OF BLACK ASPIRATIONS

Even before the 1960's, some studies reported higher vocational and/or educational aspirations among Negro than among white youth.[31] In 1952, Boyd's study of Portland, Oreg., matched white and Negro students by socioeconomic status and IQ and found Negro children to have the higher aspirations; the situation in Portland was unchanged some 12 years later.[32]

During the early 1950's, Goff studied vocational aspirations of Negro youths in Durham, N.C. They ranged in age from 6 to 8 years and 12 to 14 years. She found that "feelings of confidence are expressed more often than not, positive attitudes of competence exist more frequently than negative ones, ambitions are directed toward occupations which yield substantial economic returns, success in area of performance are most often expected, and wishes generally are in terms of further self-enhancement."[33] Their personal experience of ego-deflation had not led them to doubt their own personal capacity to advance economically and socially. On the other hand, among the children of families in the upper income level of the sample, boys were less optimistic about their chances. Goff explained the greater realism by noting that among boys "there is more movement and mingling outside the home and class-room with greater opportunity for sharp person-to-person comparisons and increased awareness of group standards. Outlooks, as a result, are less hopeful."[34]

Grier conducted a followup study of the 1956 graduates of all-Negro Dunbar high school in Washington, D.C. The school was known then as one of the best of its kind in the country. At graduation, a large majority of the students said they wanted to enter a profession. In 1961, however, only one-fourth still held to this aspiration. Only 7 of the 46 Dunbar graduates had earned a bachelor's degree, but 71 in all had entered college. Grier comments on one aspect of the outcome: "Since the home environment itself offered little in the way of useful career advice, it is possible that the aid offered by the school was inadequate to the unusually stringent demands upon it."[35]

Nam, Rhodes, and Herriott analyzed data from the decennial censuses as well as later data collected by the Bureau of the Census relating to unequal educational opportunities. Some of their findings relevant to aspirations follow:

> Among white-collar families, Negroes are far more likely [than whites] to plan on going to college; among lower-status families, the racial difference is small and favors Negroes . . . There is a tendency for Negro students to plan for a higher level of education than their mothers expect them to attain (especially in lower status families). The study reveals a large discrepancy between the enrollment status and the plans of students in the low-income and non-white collar groups of the central cities—particularly for Negroes. The majority of the students in these groups say they plan to go to college, yet it is just these groups that have the highest rates of nonenrollment.[35]

The researchers did not restrict these generalizations to any special section of the country.

Since 1960, a number of more or less controlled studies have been made of Negro-white differences in aspiration, both under conditions of school segregation and desegregation.

Blake studied level of aspiration in a suburban area near a large midwestern city.[37] He matched three groups of students on socioeconomic status, IQ, and and achievement:

Group W: 59 white students from integrated high schools
Group NI: 59 Negro students from integrated high schools
Group NS: 59 Negro students from segregated high schools.

In the integrated schools, Negroes were a minority but the schools were not transitional to Negro. The school administrators were reputedly fair to Negro children.

Blake set out to test four hypotheses:[38]

1. On average, Negro pupils will have higher levels of aspiration than those of their white counterparts in the mixed school situation.
2. There will be greater variability in the aspirations of the minority group in the segregated school system than in the mixed school system.
3. The Negro pupils in the mixed school sample will show a higher average level of aspiration than the Negroes in segregated school samples.
4. The average aspiration will be approximately the same for whites and Negroes in the integrated school group, but there will be greater variability in the segregated Negro group.

Negro students in integrated schools set higher aspirational levels than their white fellow students. The first hypothesis was thus supported. The second hypothesis was rejected. Negro students in the segregated schools did not set a wider range of aspirational levels than both other groups; they set fewer low aspirational levels than either Negroes or whites in integrated schools. The third hypothesis was also rejected. Negroes in the integrated schools failed to set higher average aspirational levels than Negroes in segregated schools. Finally, the fourth hypothesis was rejected inasmuch as segregated Negro students had higher average levels of aspiration than did whites in integrated schools. The segregated Negro students were the highest aspiring of all three groups.

Blake interprets the high aspirations of segregated Negroes as a defensive measure whereby the student attempts to maintain his self-esteem. To set a low goal might be interpreted by others as an admission of lower self-esteem. It is not desegregation but segregation, in Blake's opinion, that threatens the Negro's self-esteem: "The more rigidly segregated total environment is much more constantly devaluing to the Negro."[39] Blake rejects an alternative explanation which holds that because the segregated school is a protective environment against the harsh reality of discrimination, Negro children find it "safer to set high goals with or without expecting to attain them."[40]

Be that as it may, two points should be kept in mind. One, that integrated Negro students of like intelligence, socioeconomic status, and achievement set higher aspirational levels than did their white counterparts. Two, despite the matching, the segregated Negro children responded defensively. They were not able to accept themselves as realistically as did the integrated Negro students.

In 1960 Wilson studied the social aspects of aspirations in the public schools of Berkeley, Calif.[41] He had three aims: ". . . To determine the extent of the differences in social composition between the elementary schools, to confirm the relationship between familial background and academic ahievement and aspirations, but, particularly, to investigate how the differing school milieux might modify this relationship."[42]

Wilson found, as expected, that children of higher social status achieved more than children of a lower status. More interestingly, he also found that children from roughly similar social backgrounds achieved across a wide range. A key to these discrepancies turned out to be what might be called the social geography of the Berkeley schools: families of the highest social status were concentrated in the Hills; of the next highest, in the Foothills, and of the lowest, in the Flats. At the same time, each geographical area also contained some families of every social group. In speaking of academic achievement, Wilson reports: "The children of professionals in the Foothills attained a poorer average than their compeers in the Hills; the children of manual workers in the Foothills, almost equalling the white-collar group in the same schools, were far superior to those in the Flats."[43]

Academic achievement was found to depend not on broad social status affiliation but on the social climate of the school. Children of the same social background achieved more if they attended a higher status school. This held for children of every social status. At the same time, Wilson discovered that teachers tended to allocate school marks according to social class criteria. In lower status schools—where lower academic standards prevailed—children of high status received as many A's and B's as their social counterparts in upper status schools.

When it comes to aspirations, according to Wilson, social status factors do not operate in so clear-cut a manner. In fact, "more Negroes in the Flats, where they are a majority, have high aspirations, than in the Foothills, where they are a minority."[44] School children, however, tend to adopt the aspirations of their peers. In the Flats, each child has much more contact with other children who do not aspire to college. The non-college aspirants make up a very cohesive group. "Relatively, then, terminal students are the social leaders in the lower socioeconomic strata. They gain social support from their peers, and, in turn, set the pace for them, without adopting the standards of success prevalent in the wider community of adults."[45] In the Hills more children are isolates whose very isolation protects their high aspirations from the corrosive effect of low achievers.

Wilson views the segregation of Negroes in Berkeley schools from the standpoint of constructive group functioning. The presence of high aspirations among lower class Negroes demonstrates "that a segregated social minority can generate and maintain higher hopes than when integrated. It can develop its indigenous leadership, and is not demoralized by continuous tokens of their imposed inferiority."[46] Clearly, a fundamental conflict exists between Blake's and Wilson's interpretations of the psychological content of segregation. Blake regarded segregation as "constantly devaluing to the Negro" whereas Wilson states that segregation prevents demoralization of the segregated. A crucial question remains: Is the sense of "imposed inferiority" more intense under segregation than under integration? The weight of the evidence presented in the remainder of this chapter probably uspports the view that segregation is more destructive.

Geisel studied Negro and white aspirations in Nashville, Tenn.[47] He compared 1,245 white with 777 Negro students in 7th, 8th and 12th grades. While white students had a significantly higher mean IQ score (108.2 vs. 89.7), Negro vocational and educational goals were significantly higher.[48] Geisel observed that significant differences between Negroes and whites existed not only in IQ and aspiration scores, but also with respect to "participation patterns, attitudes, and self- and life-concept dimensions for both upper and lower socioeconomic status groups."[49]

Extracurricular school activities were distinctly white specialties. However, Negro students were highly active in the Negro community. (It should be recalled that Nashville in this period was a leading center of southern civil rights activity.) As Geisel put it: "The school is a status symbol but the outside activities are where Negroes can enjoy life."[50]

Within the school itself, the teacher plays a most important role for the Negro child:

> The teacher for the white child is likely to be simply an instrumental agent of the school. For the Negro child she also represents a status position and a respected social role . . . The Negro child who feels he is important in the eyes of the teacher is optimistic about the future and also thinks that education is very important. This pattern is much less pronounced for white youth.[51]

By inference, the significantly higher self-concept scores registered by Negroes might will reflect this more personal meaning of school and especially of the teacher.

The values of the Negro subcommunity are reflected in vocational choices of Negro youth. About half of the Negro students said they wanted to become teachers, physicians, lawyers, social workers, ministers, morticians, and nurses.[52] These are vocations that can be practiced directly within the Negro community. A recent study seemed to counter Geisel's finding about concentration in "Negro" careers as a southern phenomenon.[53] Bindman, in his study of Negro students at the University of Illinois, found the same more or less true in the North: "(1) Negro students are occupationally oriented in selecting their colleges and courses of study, and (2) Negro students select careers in which they can be reasonably certain of finding remunerative employment."[54]

Yet, the psychological threat of the white community takes its toll, especially as evidenced by responses by 12th grade students in Geisel's sample. By that time, Negro-white differences in educational aspirations have largely disappeared. Tests on students' perception of realities that might block their future show the greatest sensitivity "in 12th grade where contact and potential competition with whites in the occupations world is imminent."[55] Realism marks the choice of fields of vocational concentration as it registers the apprehensiveness felt by the soon-to-be graduate.

Over a period of one year, P.S. 198 in Manhattan, a six-grade school, was desegregated. The student body was divided: one-half Puerto Rican, one-third Negro, and one-sixth other. Children were tested in October 1960 and June 1961.[56] Their vocational aspirations were found to vary with the social composition of the classroom. Without exception, among children representing an ethnic minority in a classroom, fewer chose a professional or semiprofessional occupation. The tendency away from such aspirations was strongest among Negroes and weakest among white non-Puerto Ricans. In addition, both Negro and Puerto Rican students were more expressive in classes in which they were a minority. White non-Puerto Ricans showed the opposite tendency.

Powell studied the aspirations of talented Negro youth in the segregated schools of Alabama.[57] His sample was 100 11th and 12th grade students who scored very high on the California Test of Mental Maturity: above the 85th percentile on the national norm and between the 93rd and 99th percentiles on the Alabama statewide norm.[58] Nearly 40 of the 100 did not plan to attend college. As several of them explained to Powell: "I don't have the money to attend college and If I did attend all I could do would be to teach school or carry mail."[59] Of the 61 planning to attend college, 46 preferred to attend a desegregated college; all but four would select such a college outside the South. (Data were collected during 1959; several years after, probably even more of the students would have considered desegregated colleges.)

Three factors influenced a student's decision to seek a college education: (1) college attendance by a sibling; (2) the presence of a counselor in the high school; and (3) strong maternal approval. The decision was not dependent on the father's occupation or income.

Vocational aspirations were heavily in the direction of teaching: 58 percent of the boys and 41 percent of the girls.[60] Nearly three quarters of the boys not planning to go to college wanted to learn a skilled trade.[61]

Gist and Bennett investigated aspirations in four Kansas City high schools; 412 Negro students were compared with 461 white students.[62] When IQ and socioeconomic status were held constant, no significant differences existed in either occupational or educational aspiration. Geisel had found significant differences between Negro and white and declared: "... We have rediscovered subculture."[63] Gist and Bennett, however, declared flatly: "...This study seems to add to the growing evidence that there is no such thing as a Negro subculture when general attitudes toward occupations or education are the focus of attention."[64] Part of the difference between these two conclusions may lie with the degree that socioeconomic influences were controlled. Gist and Bennett claim only to have "crudely controlled"[65] such influences while Geisel states that his Negro and white subjects "are obviously not truly comparable."[66] The difference may also be explained by the fact that two Negro populations were studied.

Gottlieb studied Negro-white differences in aspirations and fulfillment in seven high schools.[67] His sample was divided into four categories:

1. All students in two all-Negro high schools in the South.
2. All students in two all-white high schools in the South.
3. A 25 percent sample of Negro and white students in a northern interracial high school.
4. A 25 percent sample of students in an all-Negro high school in the North.

Negroes had higher college-going aspirations, and Negroes from southern segregated schools had higher aspirations than Negroes in the interracial northern school. Expectations diverged from aspirations; the two were less discrepant among southern Negro students, more discrepant among Negroes in interracial schools.

Gottlieb then probed the relationship between goal fulfillment and teachers. It was hypothesized that student-teacher involvement would be at its peak "where the student perceived goal consensus and an ability as well as desire on the part of the teacher in the goal-attainment process."[68]

While students tended to believe that they and their teachers shared common goals, this tendency was strengthened as social class of student rose. Negroes, however, tended to see a discrepancy between their goals and those held by teachers. No racial difference existed in students' assessment of their teachers' ability to help students attain their goals. With respect to teachers' desire to help, however, an important difference existed: "...Lower socioeconomic youth and especially Negro youth are least likely to perceive the teacher as someone with a desire to facilitate goal attainment."[69] Gottlieb speculated: "It seems quite likely that Negro students are more apt to see Negro as opposed to white teachers as understanding their goals and as having a desire to help the student attain goals."[70] In segregated classrooms Negro students may find discussion of Negro problems easier than in interracial classrooms.

Gottlieb draws a sharp distinction between an integrated and a merely interracial school. In the former, children of all backgrounds are represented through the social system of the school. In the latter, children of different backgrounds coexist. In interracial schools, according to the findings of Project Talent, Negro youths achieve at higher levels than in segregated schools. On the other hand, the same data reveal that "incidents of school dropout, absenteeism, and delinquency are less likely . . . to occur in all-Negro schools within the South."[71] While Gottlieb concludes that segregated schools are inferior to genuinely integrated schools, he also holds that in some respects the southern segregated school is inferior to the merely interracial school.

Brown studied aspirations in rural central Florida.[72] The subjects were 41 matched pairs of Negro and white sixth graders. Negro children revealed significantly higher vocational aspirations. The children as a whole aspired to higher occupations than those of their fathers; this was especially true of Negro children.

Aspirations among Negro and white boys in the Boston area were studied by Meeks.[73] He compared the following groups:

Group A	20 lower class Negro boys from Roxbury
Group B	18 lower middle class white boys from South Boston
Group C	18 middle class Negro boys from Roxbury
Group D	20 middle class white boys from upper middle class private schools in Boston area.

Aspiration levels were ascertained by student performance on an experimental mechanical testing device. Meeks had expected to find lower class boys with higher aspirations; the reverse occurred. He predicted Negro boys would have lower aspirations than whites; he found there was no significant difference. On the other hand, he observed—as he had predicted—that "lower class Negroes will have aspirations which are significantly lower than any other race-class combination."[74] He also predicted with success that "lower class Negro subjects will have significantly lower aspirations with Negro experimenters than with white experimenters . . ."[75]

In a real sense, Meeks' study does not belong here as it did not take place in an actual school setting; it was designed and conducted as a typical psychological laboratory experiment. Its conclusions differ sharply with virtually all others in one respect: Meeks fails to find Negro aspirations higher than white aspirations. Unfortunately, the research report contains no acknowledgment of the exceptional nature of this finding. The controls over social class were not strong in this study, thus highlighting the role of class. In addition, Meeks' theoretical orientation is psychoanalytical. This leads him to conceive of the lower class Negro as an objectively defeated person who is unable to make the standards of the society's ego ideal—i.e., the white man—his own. The lower class Negro is thus regarded as a man without a father. "The defeated attitude with which they [lower class Negroes] approach goal-setting is a result of the ego's yielding to environmental realities and repressing the standards of the ego ideal. They fantasy 'rescue' by neither the socially impotent real father nor the abstract, hostile white model."[76] This explanation suffers from one central failing: It is contradicted by most consequential studies in the field.

Sain studied vocational aspirations among 258 students in a Detroit ghetto school.[77] Occupational preferences and the expectations for the 130 boys follow, for the three top ranking careers.

Career	Preference percent	Expectation percent
Engineer	23.8	17.7
Physician	9.2	6.2
Teacher	6.9	6.2

The scholastic average of the students in this school can be judged from the scores on a standard achievement test battery taken by 317 students in grade 10B. On vocabulary, the mean score was more than 2 years below grade level, and for reading comprehension only a little less than 2 years wider. Sain adds that " many students scored on approximately a 4.0 to 5.9 grade level in certain sections of the test."[79]

Odell directed a large scale survey of the Philadelphia public schools.[80] One part of the report traced the city's 1961 high school graduates and enabled a check to be made upon the high educational aspirations of lower ranked Negro students. Here is a compilation by percent showing lower ranked Negro and white boys who graduated in 1961, and where they went after graduation:[81]

I.Q. level group	Went to college	Other school	Armed forces
White boys	percent	percent	percent
3rd quarter	13	7	16
4th quarter	3	3	6
Negro boys			
3rd quarter	32	0	28
4th quarter	8	5	23

Forty of every 100 Negro graduates in the lower half of the class, by IQ level, actually entered college; the corresponding figure for whites with equivalent IQ scores was 16. This would indicate a greater realism behind high aspirations than might appear at first glance.

St. John studied the relationship of segregation and aspirations.[82] She hypothesized that "the greater the average percent Negro of schools attended in elementary grades one through nine, the lower the educational aspirations of Negro high school students."[83] The findings, however, did not support the hypothesis.

Goldberg and Cowan, in probing certain fantasy behavior related to the achievement role of the Negro male, found that Negro college girls oriented to matriarchy were able to conceive of the Negro male as a potential achiever.[84] This view was expressed in the course of the projective Thematic Apperception Tests (TAT). "... Although the Negro male may be culturally devaluated," observe the researchers, "in fantasy he is seen as striving toward achievement–related goals."[85] Perhaps, they conclude, this indicates a changing conception of the role of the Negro male.

Cramer, Bowerman, and Campbell studied educational aspirations of southern Negro high school students.[86] Their sample covered Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Virginia. Over 10,000 Negro adolescents completed questionnaires, including followup studies; the period covered was November 1963–January 1965. None of the students, apparently, was enrolled in a desegregated school. As Wilson had found in Berkeley, so the Cramer group also reported: "...Those with low socioeconomic status may definitely benefit from being in a school environment where college-going is more or less the normal expectation."[87] This was true of the Negro students as well as a white control group.

Huson and Schiltz examined the vocational records of Negro college graduates from Louisiana.[88] Negro students came from Dillard, Grambling, Southern, and Xavier universities. White control students were from Louisiana Polytechnical Institute, Northwestern State University of Louisiana, and Tulane University. The major findings of the study were:

1. Negroes are unemployed for longer than whites.
2. Negroes start at lower salaries than whites.
3. Negroes are further behind whites in salary after 15 months of work than they were at the start.
4. All but a few Negroes work in substantially Negro environments.[89]

More than half the male Negro graduates became teachers, the occupation to which the aforementioned findings applied with the greatest force.

Fichter conducted three studies of a national sample of Negro college graduates.[90]

"Lower income Negroes," according to Fichter, "demonstrate an amazing tenacity in striving for schooling ..."[91] Although they had associated very little with college-oriented people before coming to college, Negro students nonetheless seemed to have an especially strong determination to get through college. Compared with white graduates, "the Negroes plan earlier, decide sooner, and are more strongly committed to their career choice."[92] Most enter the field of education. Extremely few prepare for business careers which they regard as the single most racially restricted field.[93]

Fichter, observing a certain self-confidence among the graduates of southern colleges, explained their mood this way:

> This Negro college graduate personally knows large numbers of Negroes who "didn't make it," perhaps he has close relatives who were "left behind" in the struggle for higher education. There is a shorter intergenerational distance between the father who did not finish grade school and who is a laborer, and the son who finishes college to be a professional. More so than the white student, therefore, he has a feeling of accomplishment and of confidence in his own proved ability. The fact is that he has overcome odds, he has fought through successfully, and his self-image may not be quite so unrealistic as it first appears to be.[94]

Another facet of this activist and expansive orientation is the same Negro college student's participation in civil rights activities. Fichter found that Negro college students were seven times likelier to participate in campus civil rights activities than were whites.[95]

Krystall, Chesler, and White made an intensive public opinion study of the Negro community in Montgomery, Ala.[96] During June, July, and November 1966, interviewers probed attitudes related to desegregation. The researchers found that "approximately 68 percent of the parents felt that the least amount of education their children needed was a college degree. Almost all parents felt sure their children would get it."[97] Only one out of five black parents seriously considered sending a child to an all-white school.[98] At the same time, 7 out of 10 approved the principle of Negro and white youngsters attending the same schools.[99]

Smith and colleagues explored various aspects of integration in the Detroit area.[100] Samples of Negro and white parents in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties were queried on aspirations for their children. Here is how they responded:[101]

Aspirations by occupational field	Responses of parents	
	White percent	Negro percent
Professional, technical, and kindred	72	67
Other white collar	12	13
Skilled blue collar	6	5
Unskilled blue collar	1	2
Miscellaneous	6	11
Don't know and not available	3	2
N=	383	92

The researchers then ascertained parental perceptions of their children's chances of attaining white collar or blue collar occupations:[102]

	Negro		White	
Achievement likelihood	White collar percent	Blue collar percent	White collar percent	Blue collar percent
Very good	47	46	62	47
Fairly good	53	41	28	40
Not so good	0	5	3	6
Poor	0	1	0	1
Other	0	7	7	6
N=	15	76	156	224

Smith and his colleague explain that Negro parents expect these rather high aspirations to materialize through an effective school system. Indeed, Negroes expressed very high support for the schools, exceeding by far the support expressed by various groups of white adults.[103]

Recent studies of aspiration among elementary school Negro children

The Franks' study of Harrisburg, Pa., discussed previously, found no significant aspirational differences between successful and unsuccessful Negro learners in the sixth grade.[104]

Alam studied Negro and white youths in three rural east central Texas counties. Negro youths felt they would meet with less economic opportunity but did not as a consequence lower their occupational expectations.[105] Proportionately, Negroes were overrepresented at both the high and low ends of the scale of occupations chosen. "For both races," noted Alam, "no significant relationship was obtained between their perception of opportunity and occupations they expect to attain."[106]

Rodman and Voydanoff, studying 255 Negro children in a Detroit, Mich., preschool and kindergarten, found parents' aspirations for their children ranged widely. The spread was broader for lower class parents than for middle class parents; indeed, the higher the social class, the narrower the span of aspirations. The researchers advise that to promote social mobility, the lower class parents must become convinced of the practicality of aspirations; it was not necessary to convince them of the desirability of high aspirations for their children.[107]

Veroff and Peele at the University of Michigan studied some of the consequences of closing a predominantly Negro elementary school and transferring its students to six racially mixed schools. Then these transferred children were compared with a similar group who attended a predominantly Negro school. After a year of desegregation, the transferred Negro children had acquired "consistently higher autonomous achievement motivation scores" than Negro boys who remained in the black school.[108] Desegregation seemed to have moderated the "unrealistically high aspirations of the Negro boys . . ."[109] while at the same time giving rise to a greater self-confidence. The researchers declare:

> To guard against defensive overaspiration in children a desegregation program has to juggle two paradoxical factors. It first must avoid placing Negro or white children in positions in schools that make them feel a salient "minority" status. It must also provide contact with children whose background represents a higher status than their own. All of this suggests the desirability of a school desegregation program that promotes a thorough intermixing of children of different races and social classes.[110]

A point of considerable practical import is made by Henderson. He stresses that the need of lower class Negro boys for enhanced self-concept is separate from their need to come to know a broad range of occupations. Often, successful Negro practitioners are invited to speak to classrooms of Negro youths. Henderson observes that while such events may bolster youthful self-concept, they will also limit the range of occupations for students to consider. As Henderson explains: ". . .Lower class white students with middle class white role models will be exposed to considerably *more* occupational alternatives than will lower class Negro students with middle class Negro role models."[111]

Recent studies of aspirations among junior high and high school students

Wylie and Hutchins studied samples of Negro and white junior high and high school students in Illinois and Pennsylvania. Over a 6 year period they found that more Negroes than whites wished to attend college and were convinced they were able to do so.[112] More of them also report being encouraged by their parents. In Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla., Carwise found that students at an all-Negro school had very high educational aspirations. Achievement was more closely related to the students' own attitudes toward further education than to those of parents.[113]

Durig explored the possible interrelations of occupational choice and social class background or neighborhood. He studied Negro and white students in three Indianapolis, Ind., high schools. He found that occupational aspirations of white boys were related not to neighborhood but to the prestige level of their fathers' occupation. For Negro boys, however, aspirations exceeded the prestige level of fathers' occupations. Why was this so? Durig speculated that the reason lay with the integration of the school and the neighborhood in which the sample Negroes studied and resided. Referring to the Negro students, Durig explained: "In their striving toward emancipation they compare themselves with members of the dominant group. This comparison might motivate them to emulate the occupational aspirations as well as the values of the dominant group. This motivation is undoubtedly increased among Negroes in an integrated neighborhood."[114] (Most of the white students in the integrated school came from white collar families.)

Thorpe studied aspirations for a professional or technical occupation among high school students in five North Carolina cities—Asheville, Charlotte, Fayetteville, Salisbury, and Shelby. Race *per se* was found to be of minor importance. With social class controlled, for example, white and Negro boys had identical aspirational levels.[115] Boys of higher social class in both races were better informed about required formal training for professional and technical occupations.

Negro girls, Thorpe found, were the most ambitious of all. These higher strivings were based on fact rather than fantasy.

> Although the matriachal pattern of Negro family structure appears to be rooted in slavery, its perpetuation may rest in education . . . The 1960 Census revealed that for all white persons 25 years of age and over who had completed 4 or more years of college, 39 percent were women. For Negroes, the figure was 53 percent.[116]

Thus, considerably more than idle aspiration lies behind the high strivings of Negro girls in this study.

Caplin studied self-concept and aspiration of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students in three schools in a small northern New Jersey city in the New York City metropolitan area.[117] He compared white and Negro children in a de facto segregated school, a newly desegregated school, and a school that had been desegregated for a long time. Both white and Negro children had significantly higher aspirations in the newly desegregated school than in the de facto segregated school. Caplin warns that "the school must take positive action to protect and enhance this initial gain."[118] Unfortunately, the research did not establish levels of aspiration of children prior to their entry into the newly desegregated school. Consequently, it is altogether possible that the superiority of these children on aspiration antedated desegregation.

Rhodes examined the effect of a mother's aspiration for her child upon the child's own aspiration for higher education. He found it to be the single most important factor and not equalled by any peer group influence. School climate was regarded as distinctly secondary in effect. Low aspirations by Negro mothers tend to be countervailed in their effect by high aspirations of friends. While Negroes are less likely than whites to be enrolled in college preparatory curriculums–the percentages are 16 and 41 respectively–if mother and child have high aspirations for college the percentages change to 32 and 60.[119] "Negroes", Rhodes concludes, "were less likely to be enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum. Therefore, any program to increase Negro attendance at college should include counseling or direction in the early years of the secondary school experience."[120] In a supplement to that of Rhodes' study, Mommsen declared that while Negroes did not regard education as the only means of leaving the ghetto, this high valuation of education is part of the black American subculture."[121] A study by Allen and Robinson in Logan County, Okla. attests to the fact that high Negro maternal aspirations for children are not universal. Comparing aspirations of Negro mothers on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or other welfare programs with those of nonwelfare mothers, the Langston University researchers reported: "Both groups manifest a low degree of both interest and influence in their children's vocational aspirations . . . Many mothers gave neutral responses on job aspirations such as 'I would like any job but just so it is a good job.'"[122]

In Dade County, Fla., Curtis studied vocational aspirations of Negro students in segregated and desegregated schools. Students had attended the desegregated schools for 2 to 3 years. They tended to state they were preparing for professional, technical, managerial, clerical, and sales careers. Students in the segregated school selected mostly service occupations, machine trades, bench work, and structural work.[123] Curtis felt that many poorly prepared students who selected highly specialized careers were "choosing these jobs in an effort to improve their self-esteem."[124]

Gurin and associates made two studies of motivation among Negro college students. In the first study, they found that elementary or high school teaching was the career choice of 24 percent of the males and 44 percent of the females. This, as noted in Fichter's earlier studies, was a traditional career choice for southern Negroes especially. Whether a nontraditional career choice will be made depends in part upon the student's world outlook. Gurin and Katz cited an example: "The males who have high self-confidence about academic success and strong beliefs that they, rather than the exigencies of fate, can control what happens in their own lives also aspire to more prestigeful, demanding, and nontraditional occupations than do males with lower generalized expectancies of success."[125]

But Negro students learn to take the overarching fact of racial discrimination into account in their career calculations. Clearly, to acknowledge the importance of discrimination is to recognize a factor beyond one's control. Attention to discrimination, emphasize the researchers, "may not imply a sense of powerlessness but rather an enhanced capacity to cope that comes from being more reality-oriented about both the obstacles and opportunities for a Negro in this society."[126]

Socioeconomic status as such tells us little about these students' aspirations. Grouping all students from lower status homes, for example, produces no meaningful pattern. Separating high-ability and low-ability students from such homes, however, reveals a stark contrast: aspirations of the latter are "severely depressed."[127] The high-ability students are not as heavily penalized by the absence in their homes of "high-aspirant models" inasmuch as teachers and other models had proved adequate substitutes.[128]

In a second study, Gurin and associates analyzed the interrelationships between motivation and what is known as "internal-external control." This concept describes either those who accept a personal responsibility for events, rather than blaming or thanking others (internal); or those who tend to see external events and/or forces as the initiators of action affecting them, and who tend therefore to place the blame or credit on others (external). In a middle class model, internal orientation is usually considered normal or even healthy, while external orientation is regarded as dysfunctional for academic achievement.

This distinction, contend the researchers, cloaks more than it reveals when applied to Negro students. A strictly internal orientation would lead a Negro student to accept personal blame for many learning problems directly attributable to socially imposed patterns of racial discrimination. In the Gurin–Katz study, Negro students of high ability who had an internal orientation were the same ones who tended to select jobs less traditional for Negroes. At the same time, they acknowledged the presence of discrimination as a limiting factor upon their aspirations. Gurin and associates in their study distinguish between personal and collective aspirations. The former stresses advancement by individual Negroes; the latter, advancement by Negroes as a whole. Personal control and racial militancy were negatively related.[129] This did not necessarily mean that racial militants desired to overthrow the existing system but rather that they wished "to remove the barriers to Negro mobility within the system. . ."[130] Thus, high Negro aspirations tend to operate within a collective framework (and are external) but tend to facilitate individual mobility (and are also internal).

TRENDS IN RESEARCH ON ASPIRATIONS

During the early 1970's, several main lines of research on aspiration are evident. All are extensions of previous research. These include: sense of personal control, black-white aspirational differences, and desegregation and aspirations.

SENSE OF PERSONAL CONTROL

The most creative and probing of recent studies in the sense of personal control area was done by Jorgensen, a black researcher. He offered an alternative to the interpretation put forward in the Coleman Report. Coleman found high sense of personal (internal) control among blacks to be related to higher academic achievement. He explained the correlation as reflecting the beneficial effect of white classmates on black students. A predominantly white, middle class milieu presumably stimulated blacks to greater belief in themselves and in their future.

Jorgensen rejects this view. His alternative is based, in part, on a close study of four southern and four northern high schools. It also reflects his own experience as a student in a desegregated school. "My personal experience," he writes, "was . . . that when following desegregation I found that I was as good or better than the best white students in mathematics, a possibility I had not foreseen, my sense of personal control increased immediately and dramatically."[131] More broadly, as the myth of white supremacy loosens its hold on blacks, they are enabled to function more in accordance with their actual capacity. (Fanon would wholeheartedly endorse such a finding.) Jorgensen generalizes:

> . . .Increases in black students' sense of personal control through desegregation do not come because black students are influenced by white students' attitudes. They come from explosion of myths about black-white differences. It is undoubtedly much easier for black students to imagine being successful in later life when they have learned that black and white abilities are roughly equivalent.[132]

Another welcome implication of this research is its view of the school as a potentially active factor in the student's life.

Jorgensen is not concerned with discovering the control ideology of black students; that is, whether they believe that people in general have or lack the ability to control events. He wants to discover how they regard their own chances. (Most studies deal with the ideological aspect of control.) Nor does Jorgensen himself adopt an ideological view of segregation and desegregation. Studying six segregated schools (four in Atlanta, two in Detroit) and two nonsegregated schools (in Detroit), Jorgensen did find a greater sense of personal control in the latter two schools. However, he also found that in the same schools "black students frequently began to feel very powerless and impotent in the face of racial oppression such as degradation or nonappreciation of black culture, being forced to study racially biased and inaccurate texts, or having disproportionately small numbers of black teachers and administrators."[133] On balance, although not inevitably so, beneficial influences predominated, according to Jorgensen.

Three additional studies dealt with control ideology. White found that attendance of southern black students in a desegregated high school during their junior and senior years resulted in a heightened sense of internal control.[134] Buck and Austrin conducted a study in St. Louis of 50 matched pairs of black high school students, divided as adequate and inadequate academic achievers. The former held more strongly to an internal control ideology. Among the inadequate achievers, the external ideology–i.e., a belief that one's own efforts do not count much in the world–functioned as consolation for failure. As the researchers put it, for these students the external ideology "represents an effort to cope with feelings of despair and hopelessness that arise from their realizing the improbability of successful achievement in the prevailing educational situation."[135] (Incidentally, all students in the Buck-Austrin study were in the normal range of IQ.) The mothers of the 100 participants held uniformly high academic expectations for their children, regardless of achievement level. Home conditions were thus of no explanatory value in distinguishing between the two groups of students.

Entwisle and Greenberger studied the relationship of control and achievement but narrowed the area of control to academic matters rather than the world at large. Seven schools in Maryland, containing a total sample of 664 ninth graders of various ethnic backgrounds, were analyzed. Black students attended four nonsegregated schools while three schools were predominantly white. The principal finding of a racial nature was that "black boys feel themselves responsible for academic success to a greater degree than do whites . . . and black boys of average or below average intelligence express feelings of control like those expressed by high IQ whites."[136A] Thus, blacks tended toward internality. Unlike Jorgensen, Entwisle and Greenberger did not offer a theory to explain the dynamics of black internality.

In another study, Entwisle and Webster analyzed the effect of adult encouragement on achievement expectations of black elementary school students in the Baltimore area. The researchers set up an experiment whereby black and white students received encouragement after one testing and then were retested. The question was whether the encouragement would raise expectations for black success both by the white and black children. One of the three schools involved had been nonsegregated for a number of years. In that school, especially, black children showed a significant increase in self-expectations. They acted in line with a view that their ability to achieve was being strengthened.[136B] Entwisle and Webster suggest that a stable integrated school encourages a higher self concept by black children and minimized the viewing of race as a disabling factor in black achievement by either black or white children.[136C]

BLACK-WHITE ASPIRATIONAL DIFFERENCES

The more recent studies tend consistently to find relative aspiration levels comparable; at times black children's are higher, at other times, lower.

Cosby studied aspirations of 5,992 10th graders in 75 Deep South high schools. Overall, whites had the higher aspirations, but when students were matched by socioeconomic status, the blacks registered higher levels.[137] In Greensboro, N.C., Foster found no aspirational differences on a racial basis when the socioeconomic factors were controlled.[138] Eppes reported that "many black males but only a few white males engaged in boastful overestimation of the scores they would attain . . . and seemed to ignore the fact that their actual performances often fell far short of their stated goals."[139] He found this to be especially true of black students with high internal patterns of personal control. Part of this could be explained, Eppes added, by the general social pattern of withholding rewards and encouragement from talented blacks. Such practices facilitated externality and a tendency to avoid realistic self-appraisal. "Indulgence in wish-fulfilling goals for themselves" thus became the norm for high external blacks, according to Eppes.[140]

In 1967, Richmond studied educational aspirations among 823 black students in a predominantly black junior high school in Pittsburgh. Richmond was struck by the fact that 52 percent of the students wanted to graduate from a 4-year college, even though only 39 percent expected to attain this high goal.[141] While considerably fewer than one-tenth of the parents had attended college, nearly three-fifths of the students reported at least one parent wanted their children to complete a college education. Parental desires were matched in significance by school track as a determinant of student aspiration; both factors joined with a third—peer influence. The track system functioned as a great magnifier of existing differences among students: "In the non-college tracks, 22 percent desire and expect to finish a college education compared to 64 percent of the students in the college course of study."[142] A special value of Richmond's study is to counter the stereotype of the predominantly black school as a monolithic dampener of aspirations. True, 46 percent of the students neither desired nor expected to complete college. At the same time, the internal organization of the school apparently added to the likelihood that they would never do either.

A single study has dealt with the educational aspirations of black and white high school girls. Brindley surveyed 200 11th and 12th graders in four Cleveland area schools. Two were predominantly white, two predominantly black. The schools also differed by social class. Brindley found that black and white students in middle class schools had comparably high aspirations which were consonant with the expectations of teachers and counselors.[143] Girls in the lower class white school also tended toward middle class aspirational choices. On the other hand, the choices of lower class black girls were significantly more modest. Brindley concludes that this finding resulted in part from the failure of teachers, counselors, and parents to advise the students that career chances for black young women have broadened in recent years.

In New York City two studies, separated by a dozen years or so, came to opposite conclusions on parental aspirations for their children. Lorenz, using 1960 data for 177 black and white adults living in a nonsegregated public housing project, found that black parents had somewhat lower educational aspirations for their children than was true of the white parents.[144] More recently Brook and others studied the parents of 292 children in the first and fifth grades of 12 schools in New York City. They found no significant differences between black and white students on occupational aspirations or expectations. Black parents, however, did have higher aspirations for their children than did white parents.[145] It is not possible to decide whether the disparate findings over a dozen years reflect a change in relative aspirations by black and white parents or whether these were somehow unrepresentative of black and white parents as a whole.

DESEGREGATION AND ASPIRATIONS

Surprisingly few studies have been made of aspirations under varying conditions of racial mixture. Abramson reported from a study of 44 black students in two Philadelphia junior high schools that the students in a racially balanced school had far higher aspirational levels than students in an all-black school.[146] He was not sure whether this finding indicated that the nonsegregated students were simply expressing unrealistic aspirations or whether the high aspirations presaged rising academic achievement by the same students. Hall studied occupational aspirations of black and white high school male seniors in 51 Texas schools. Aspirational levels, he found, were unaffected by the racial composition of classrooms.[147] The same was true of occupational expectations. This latter finding should be tempered by the fact that fewer than one-quarter of the black seniors answered the questions involved. Overall, Hall concluded, desegregation had not altered the aspirational patterns of students. He speculated that such a change hinged on the desegregation of other institutions in the community.

Ansell, in a study of 375 lower class white and black students in four schools, found no difference in the vocational maturity of both groups.[148] (Students ranged from 8th to 12th grade.) Together, the lower class students lagged about 2 years behind white middle class students in vocational maturity. In a study of 324 black high school seniors in North Carolina, White and Knight reported that desire to attend college was more characteristic of students in a segregated than a desegregated school.[149] This was especially true of female students. The researchers interpret the main finding as indicating a greater realism among black students in desegregated schools.

Crain, in a national sample study, analyzed the attendance of black students in nonsegregated schools in relation to their occupational attainment later in life. He found that the public school not only might educate the black students in an academic sense, but it also provided them with opportunities to build interracial associations that could prove valuable in occupational success. Crain summarizes his findings, as follows:

> . . .(a) Negroes from integrated schools are more likely to hold "nontraditional" jobs–jobs which have relatively few Negroes in them, (b) Negroes in nontraditional jobs will earn more money than those in traditional jobs, hence (c) Negroes from integrated schools will have higher incomes, and (d) Negroes with white friendships will have access to information about the labor market which they can use to obtain these nontraditional jobs, hence, (e) Negroes from integrated schools will have more knowledge about jobs.[150]

These findings are highly consistent with repeated conclusions by other researchers about the increased aspirational "realism" of black students in desegregated schools.

Epps warns about possible abuses of this growing aspirational realism. Black students, he notes, are criticized for having too low and too high aspirations: "Moderation in everything seems to be the theme of this type of theory."[151] The great danger is that school authorities may undertake "the task of imposing realism upon minority students by administrative methods such as tracking."

SELF CONCEPT

While aspirations constitute a basic dimension of the self, the interest here extends to probing the self as a whole, and the student's own conception of her or his self. The formal study of the self is of long duration but the field has been more successful in drawing distinctions than arriving at definitive conclusions. In this section, however, the principal concern is the educational significance of self research than the exact boundaries of various subdivisions of self as an entity. An attempt is made to classify studies with reference to the racial or interracial setting of the school involved in the research, as in the preceding chapter.

SELF CONCEPT AND SEGREGATION

Weddington studied various aspects of racial and class stereotypes among young children.[152] She selected 374 Negro and White children attending three schools in Gary, Ind. (In 1948, when the children were tested, school segregation was legal in Indiana.) One school was all Negro, another was all white, and a third was white but located near a Negro area. Most significant was the researcher's effort to treat class and color as independent contributors to stereotyping. She found that Negro children assigned favorable traits to whites more frequently than they assigned the same traits to themselves. Usually, this finding was interpreted to signify the self-devaluation of the Negro child. Weddington, however, discovered that this practice was "more a function of the insidious influence of latent class designation than of skin color. . ."[153] Indeed, color bias was more evident in the white children. Favorable stereotypes tended to be assigned to persons of high social status–both Negro and white–while favorable stereotypes were assigned–interracially–to persons of lower class status.

Wendland studied 681 Negro and white eighth graders attending segregated schools in North Carolina. She found that "the Negro adolescents do not report damaging self-evaluations or feelings of unworthiness, and in fact tend to view themselves more positively and optimistically than the white sample."[154] In trying to account for self-esteem differences between Negro and white she stated that "defensiveness alone would not seem to be an adequate explanation" and, even more concretely, "it is unlikely that defensiveness accounts for a significant portion of the variance."[155]

In the testing, Wendland found the Negroes in her sample scored high on cynicism and estrangement, adding up to a pronounced negative orientation toward the larger–and white–society. Such an orientation, Wendland stresses, is not pathological; rather, it "reflects a realistic perception of the world as it often is for the Negro."[156] As previously noted, Gurin and associates have stressed the positive adaptive value of what Wendland refers to as "cynicism." Negro students thereby deny the existence of normal channels for personal progress and assert the futility of depending upon the benevolence of the majority. A high self-concept would seem to be an essential prerequisite in this psychological armamentarium.

Trent studied self-acceptance and interracial attitudes.[157] His sample consisted of 202 Negro children, ages 9 to 18, in New York City. He found that "children who were most self-accepting expressed significantly more positive attitudes toward both Negroes and whites than did children who were *least* self-accepting."[158] No indication was given of the degree of school segregation of the children involved. Self-concept among 4-year-old children was studied by Brown.[159] Over a 3-week period, 38 Negro and Puerto Rican children of lower socioeconomic status were compared with 36 upper middle class white children. In general, all the children showed highly positive self-conceptions. However, the Negro children on "self as subject" tended to conceive of themselves as:

a. sad rather than happy
b. stupid rather than smart
c sickly as distinguished from healthy
d. not liking their own facial appearance as opposed to evaluating their facial appearance favorably.[160]

Brown cautioned that his project was a pilot study for a larger undertaking and its findings should therefore be regarded as tentative.

Gibby and Gabler conducted a study in Atlantic City schools, apparently racially homogeneous, and reported that Negro-white differences in self-concept were dependent on sex and IQ levels. There were, in fact, relatively few outright racial differences that were statistically significant. In general, the researchers described the white children as more realistic in their self-appraisals.[161]

Long and Henderson studied self-concept in a rural southern community among 72 Negro and 72 white children who were to enter first grade.[162] The white children, treated as a control group, differed significantly from the Negro group in IQ, father's occupation, kindergarten experience, and other respects. Long and Henderson found that the Negro children had "a lower self-esteem . . ."[163] Significant differences on some of these variables were present within the Negro group. The researchers conclude that "for the Negro child, a realistic acceptance of the self as 'dark' may be one aspect of and possibly a prerequisite for an adequate self-esteem and a good relationship with peers."[164] The precise reasoning that led to this conclusion is somewhat unclear.

In Nashville, Binkley, studying children in apparently segregated schools, found that Negroes were not lower than whites in self-concept.[165] Clark and associates investigated self-concept among preschool children.[166] Self-concept and vocabulary comparisons were made between 95 Negro and 52 white children. While vocabulary scores of white boys were significantly higher than those of Negro boys, no significant differences were found in the area of self-concept. (A general finding of overall high self-concept repeated Brown's finding.) Clark and associates warn: ". . .The repeated emphasis on the 'negative self-image' of Negro preschool children in educational literature may need tempering lest it receive a spurious validation in the preschool classroom by becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy."[167]

Hodgkins and Stakenas compared Negro and white high school and college students in the Deep South. With socioeconomic status controlled, no significant difference existed between the groups of students in terms of self-assurance in school; the schools were segregated.[168]

In studying male undergraduates at three predominantly Negro colleges–Virginia State College, Petersburg; North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro; and Morgan State College, Baltimore–Escoffery found that a sense of "fate control" was determined far more by contemporary social forces than by "personality makeup".[169] Whether or not a Negro student believed that events in general were beyond his control, he tended to demand "freedom now."[170] He thereby asserted his belief that he could control that part of his "fate."

Frenkel studied Negro and white personality differences among 153 matched pairs of students, from Oklahoma State University in Stillwater and Oakwood College, Huntsville, Ala.[171] The Negro sample had considerably higher mean socioeconomic status scores than the whites (55.8 v. 37.5). On the tests, whites were found to have significantly higher anxiety scores; Frenkel had predicted the reverse. Negroes had higher social acquiescence scores. No racial differences were found on measures of ego strength or aggression. Frenkel was especially interested in the lower Negro anxiety and explained it by noting that the Negroes attended an all-Negro school where "lack of competition with whites and lower need-achievement might result in lower anxiety."[172] He was struck most by the relative absence of racial differences on the personality measures. He was confident that such differences did exist in the past but there was reason to believe that the differences were diminishing. Since the rise of civil rights activity, Frenkel speculated, "Negroes meet with fewer frustrating situations and hence they have less need for aggressive behavior. Instead, they have a strong need to be accepted by society at large."[173]

Derbyshire studied personal identity among Negro students at Morgan State College in Baltimore.[174] He found a pervasive sense of identity conflict among the subjects, especially concerning color. Those students most secure in their identity as Negroes were also most likely to accept other minorities.[175] Students who were unsure of their identity as Negroes tended to define their relation to others in negativistic terms: We are not sure of anything but that we don't want to be like you. Students who were more certain of their identity tended to define the Negro role in terms of sharing certain humanistic goals.

Maliver explored anti-Negro bias among Negro college students.[176] He predicted that low scorers, *i.e.*, with little such bias, would tend to identify more positively with their parents and themselves, and would tend to resist actively any attack upon themselves. All hypotheses had to be rejected in view of the findings. As Maliver concluded: "It is difficult to draw theoretical implications since the major hypotheses of the study were rejected."[177]

During the early 1970's, self-concept and segregation have been studied by several more investigators. McArdle and Young examined the self-doubts of black high school students in Madison, Wisc., whose predominantly black school was to be closed. They were to transfer to four mainly white schools. Rather than consider the possible educational advantages of the move, the black students dwelt on the prospect of being "swallowed up" and becoming powerless by virtue of being scattered among several schools.[178] While white students in the receiving schools seemed interested in socializing with the black students, the latter were thinking about what McArdle and Young call "their basic rights". White and Richmond studied 209 black and white fifth graders. Despite the fact that the blacks were considerably poorer than the whites and that their school had changed in racial composition within a single year from 95 percent white to 90 percent black, their self-perceptions were very similar to those of the whites.[179]

Bullough studied the tenacity of self-attitudes in Los Angeles area black adults who had attended segregated schools as children. Almost regardless of where they now lived—in a primarily white suburb, in an integrated neighborhood, near the ghetto, or in the black ghetto itself—the longer the adults had lived and learned in segregated circumstances, the stronger were their present feelings of alienation from society as a whole.[180] Bullough did not conclude that simply having "been" with whites would benefit blacks. Instead, stipulated Bullough, "the black child needs at least some equal status contact with whites so that he can learn that they are not more wonderful than he is."[181] This interpretation is virtually at one with that of Jorgensen, discussed earlier in this chapter.

SELF CONCEPT AND SCHOOL CLIMATE

Self-concept was touched upon in two separate studies of school climate by Henderson and Schneider discussed in chapter 5, pages 11-15, Henderson stressed that self-concepts of blacks in segregated settings were formulated with reference to conditions at the school they attended rather than to the relative status of blacks in the general community. In Henderson's view, such black students were pacing themselves against the slow movement of substandard education.[182] Schneider reported that many black students in substantially segregated schools tended to develop a sense of futility about academic achievement.[183] Such an orientation expressed an extreme lack of personal control. Bunton and Weissbach compared self-concept development of preschool black children in a public and a community controlled school. They found that the latter was more favorable for positive self-concept.[184]

Marx and Winne probed the relationship of self-concept to academic achievement among 98 fifth and sixth graders in a predominantly black, lower class school. Somewhat unexpectedly, they found no consistent connection between a student's academic self-concept and her or his academic achievement.[185] Indeed, they found a *negative* relationship between achievement and social self-concept. In other words, the "better" the student, the "less" he thought of himself in relation to his peers. The researchers, in trying to account for this seemingly contradictory connection, suggest two alternative explanations: One, academic achievement is unpopular in the school, and thus students who score high on tests are received with scorn; two, popular students will not want to risk losing their good (social) reputations by gaining a further reputation as a high achiever. In any event, conclude Marx and Winne, the hope that heightened self-concept will necessarily lead to improved achievement in the type of school used in the study is unwarranted. It might be noted that such a sweeping statement requires more support than a study concerned with a single school.

Self-concept Levels of Black and White

In only six of the cases under segregation was it possible to compare self-concept levels of black and white: three were equal; in two cases, blacks were lower; in one case, blacks were higher.

SELF CONCEPT AND INTERRACIALITY

In this section, studies of self concept are reviewed under conditions of interraciality, as defined in the previous chapter.

Singer compared white and Negro fifth graders to discover the effect of segregation and desegregation on interracial attitudes.[186] Her general hypothesis follows:

> A differential cognitive structure (the ability to maintain several attitudes and opinions simultaneously concerning another individual who is a member of the outgroup) and more positive attitudes, as a function of proximity and intelligence, should be found for children in the integrated school concerning their attitudes towards Negroes, when compared to the less differentiated perceptions and less positive attitudes towards Negroes held by the white child in a school where there is no contact with Negroes. Three schools were selected for the tes: (1) a High Exposure School (HES), where the fifth grade student body was 60 percent white and in which extensive interracial contact was evident; (2) two Low Exposure Schools (LES), one where the fifth grade student body was all white, and another in which the fifth grade enrollment was 15 percent white. While IQ scores were similar for the two schools, the white students were primarily middle class, the Negroes lower income.[197]

The white children in HES consistently scored lower on social distance toward Negroes. In accounting for white desire to have social contact with Negroes, Singer found exposure to be more important then either intelligence or sex. Unexpectedly, it did not appear that the brighter children were less prejudiced. Girls were, in general, less prejudiced than boys.

If Negro exposure to whites led to less anti-white prejudice, how did it affect Negro self-conception? Singer administered certain drawing tests to all children. Twenty-four Negro children, (out of a total of 169) colored the face of a figure supposed to be a self-portrait; not a single white child did so. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that 18 of the 24 were in HES. "In other words," observed Singer, "the Negro children who had greater contact with white children showed a tendency to differentiate themselves and assert their identity more clearly."[188]

Generally speaking, Negro children in HES had less regard for whites as academic achievers than did Negro children in LES. As Singer comments: "the segregated Negro may see the white world as one of success and his own world as one of failure. . ."[189] (This observation is supported by the research of Blake and Haggstrom; Meketon's work is also relevent.) The bright Negro girl in HES "can conceive of herself as achieving *more* than a white child, and turns to her own group rather than to whites for socialization."[190] Under integration, then, the Negro child is able "to differentiate himself without anxiety."[191] On the other hand, Negro children in the LES "were less accepting of their skin color, saw themselves as poorer achievers, and developed negative attitudes toward various nonwhite groups."[192]

Children were not merely "exposed" to one another; they interacted with each other. True, white children usually rated Negro children as "aggressive" on tests; but this was fact, not prejudice. Despite this awareness, white children in HES still were more willing to associate with

Negroes than were white children in LES. These latter white children, in fact, tended on tests to deny the existence of Negro aggression. As Singer noted: "Whites with no contact perceived the Negro in a distorted manner, giving him intellectual credit, but refusing to associate with him."[193]

Haggstrom studied self-esteem and desegregation in Detroit and Ypsilanti.[194] His sample consisted of a total of 120 Negro households in both cities. By self-esteem, he meant "self-perception of the degree to which the basic values and aspirations are realized."[195] His central finding was that desegregated Negroes have higher self-esteem than do segregated Negroes. Haggstrom tentatively concluded that this was so "because the Negro community as a symbol of inferiority depresses the self-esteem of its members."[196] The Negro community, according to Haggstrom, is a white-created symbol of "permanent social inferiority" flying in the face of the social value of equality. In the ghetto, exaggerated perceptions of whites develop, and persistent social failure there leads to further identification of Negro with failure.

Desegregated Negroes are more rejecting of the color line and more accepting of both white and Negro people. Segregated Negroes, on the other hand, tend to live within the color line and are less accepting of whites. Haggstrom found that "desegregated families more often and to a greater extent help children consciously work through problems of their feelings about racial differences."[197] In segregated milieux, racial "incidents" are, by definition, rare, and thus seldom become a topic of conversation. In interracial neighborhoods, however, it is common for desegregated Negro parents "to help their young children accept the difference in skin color and understand that they need not feel less worthy because of it. The greater number of incidents in white neighborhoods serve as occasions which lead parents explicitly to express love and esteem to their children as Negro children."[198] Desegregated Negro children are thus doubly the beneficiaries of desegregation: their parents have greater self-esteem and they themselves are more accepted for what they are and thus have a broader basis for their own self-esteem.

Haggstrom closes with a frankly speculative comment: "My guess is that Negroes of high achievement in adult life tend disproportionately either to have had desegregated childhoods or to have been children in households the adult members of which have been desegregated during childhood."[199] Lessing studied certain aspects of ego functioning of Negro and white 8th and 11th graders in three suburbs of Chicago; the schools were integrated. She sought possible implications for academic achievement. In the first phase of the study Negro children seemed significantly less willing to delay immediate gratification and were thus less able to study and learn. When Lessing controlled the effects of IQ, this apparent racial difference in gratification delay disappeared.[200] (She believes the Coleman Report overestimated the achievement effect of fate control for Negro students because IQ was not controlled.[201]) Intelligence, rather than fate control or gratification delay was the principal avenue to academic achievement, she found. For this reason, Lessing concludes, remedial programs must have a cognitive focus rather than one aimed primarily at certain ego functions. She acknowledges, of course the ultimate interdependence of all the factors.

Georgeoff tested the effects of a new social studies teaching unit on Negro and white fourth graders in Gary, Ind.; all 26 classes were integrated. The unit contained material on Negro life and history. Subjects were matched on IQ, socioeconomic status, race, and achievement. The chief finding was that self-concept scores of both white and Negro students using the new unit were significantly higher, especially if they attended schools in attendance areas with integrated housing.[202] An especially interesting aspect of this study was the rise in self-concept of white students.

In Chicago, Posner studied self-evaluation of 300 Negro, Puerto Rican, and white first grade children of differing intelligence and social class groups. Outright racial differences were not general throughout the study. Negro children showed a larger discrepancy than whites between self and ideal; on the other hand, while lower class Negro children had more negative self-images than lower class white children, no difference existed between middle class Negro and white children.[203] Among Negro children, social class difference seemed to create a deep impression; the lower class Negro child was found by Posner to have a negative self-image. (This did not prevent the researcher from making an extraordinary overstatement: "For black Americans to be accepted as equals in the mainstream of American society, it is necessary that they develop a sense of self-respect.")[204] Like Rhodes, Posner found that parents' aspirations influence significantly, perhaps crucially, the child's own aspirations and sense of self-worth.

In an integrated Manhattan elementary school, Guggenheim studied the interrelationships of self-esteem and achievement expectation. Both Negro and white children tended to overestimate their probable achievement, with the former significantly more so (86 percent vs. 58 percent).[205] This was especially true of children with high self-esteem. Guggenheim comments on the lack of support in his study for the belief that Negro children have low self-esteem. He is struck by "this aspirational perseverance exhibited by Negro pupils in the face of their obvious low achievement . . ."[206] While both Negro and white children of high self-esteem had equally high achievement expectations, white students of low self-esteem had higher expectations than did Negro children of corresponding self-esteem. This latter finding is contrary to findings of many other studies; it might reflect a greater realism on the part of Negro students arising from the desegregated situation.

Both Blake and Geisel, whose work was reviewed previously, also discussed the matter of Negro self-esteem. Blake had speculated that "the struggle to maintain self-esteem is much more difficult for Negro students in segregated schools than in integrated schools."[207] Geisel reported that his data contained no evidence that Negroes scored lower on self-concept.[208] Indeed, "Negro mean scores are significantly higher than whites on the evaluative factor of self."[209] Geisel declared: "Who are the Negroes with high self-concept scores? They are aggressive, race conscious, high achievers who epitomize the expression 'Negroes are as good as anyone else.'"[210]

In Lockwood's study of sixth graders in upstate New York, no significant self-esteem difference was found between children in racially balanced and imbalanced schools. One exception, however, is enlightening: "For the item, 'I'm pretty happy,' 76 percent of the students in the imbalanced schools responded with 'like me' and 90 percent of the students in balanced schools responded with similarity. Conversely, 19 percent of the students in imbalanced schools and only 7 percent in the balanced school responded with 'unlike me.'"[211] Carpenter and Busse studied self-concept among 80 Negro and white first and fifth graders in an eastern city. All the children came from urban, father-absent, welfare families. Negro children had somewhat less positive self-concepts than white children.[212] For both groups, self-concept scores fell significantly from first to fifth grade; for white children, the drop was greater. Negro girl first graders had the lowest self-concept.

In Wessman's study of Project ABC no sizable changes in achievement were recorded. In the area of personal changes, however, the matter was different. Wessman, who interviewed the boys over a 2-year period, reported: "One of the most striking impressions from the followup interviewing was the enormous growth in articulateness and personal expressiveness in the ABC boy."[213] The boys themselves, according to Wessman, reported as the most important changes "greater aspirations, increased self-awareness . . . self-confidence, and more tolerance . . ."[214]

The Soareses studied 514 advantaged and disadvantaged children of varied ethnic backgrounds attending two schools. One of the schools, predominantly disadvantaged, had a population two-thirds Negro and Puerto Rican and one-third mainland white; the other school was advantaged and was 90 percent white. Self-concept was higher in the disadvantaged school.[215] Miller examined two groups of Negro students, one attending a virtually all-Negro school, the other, a school in which Negroes represented about 20 percent of the enrollment. Both schools were in suburbs of Detroit, Mich. The students were not succeeding. Yet, holds Miller, they seemed "to possess the types of student attitude necessary for academic motivation: interest in education, high self-concept, and a sense of control of academic environment."[216] The major responsibility for lack of achievement, declares Miller, rests with "the institution and the negative attitudes of those who represent it."[217] In studying Negro and white students in integrated junior high schools and predominantly white high schools, Wylie and Hutchins concluded that "all things considered . . . there is no support for the commonly assumed hypothesis that Negroes' 'expressed self-estimates are lower than whites'. . ."[218] In the Dumbarton study of Oakland, Calif., discussed earlier, it was observed that there was no significant difference between the self-concept of segregated and desegregated Negro students.[219]

Four studies, based on data gathered before 1968, were published during the early 1970's. Utilizing responses to a survey of the metropolitan North in 1966, Heiss and Owens found self-concept among adult Negroes to be comparable with that of whites; no evidence was found "that blacks are 'crippled' by low self-evaluations."[220] White compared self-esteem and alienation of black and white 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-graders in 22 Detroit high schools. Blacks, and especially black males, manifested higher esteem than whites. At the same time, black youths were more alienated than white youth.[221] In the Connecticut cities of Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, Stamford, and Waterbury, Colfax examined black self-concept under various degrees of racial intermixture. While *negative* self-identities were unrelated to the racial composition of the school, black students attending nonsegregated schools had considerably more positive self-concepts than blacks attending virtually segregated schools.[222] ". . .The self-derogating preadolescent Negro," Colfax writes, "was, in fact, rarer than the self-derogating white." Yet, Colfax did observe a special sense of self among segregated black students which was "not so much negativistic as neutralized and constrained."[223]

St. John dealt with a problem of opposing trends among black students in 18 Boston schools in 1967: Desegregation seemed to increase the student's sense of control while lowering her or his academic self-concept. Racial composition of the classroom bore no reliable relation to black self-concept, along the lines of Colfax's earlier finding. Rather, it was the state of academic competition in the classroom that affected self-concept in a major way. Children formulated a self-concept comparing themselves with their classmates. In the lower class schools, according to St. John, since the competition was usually less vigorous, children felt more secure; whereas, in the middle class school, with heightened academic competition, the lower class minority child felt less sure of herself or himself.[224] Thus, a decline of self-concept in a nonsegregated classroom constituted an acknowledgement of higher standards. Children who had always attended either segregated or nonsegregated schools had the most favorable self-concept and sense of control. Those who were in the middle of a desegregation experience had the least favorable self-attitudes.

Since 1970, the number of studies of black self-concept, especially in interracial and desegregated settings, has increased markedly. As the one-race school quickly disappeared, the reality of interracial schooling took shape. Heightened interest by blacks in the future of black identity also stimulated many studies. The advent of more black social scientists and educational researchers also resulted in an expansion of research along these lines.

Butler studied self-concept changes among 180 white and black college freshmen in a nonsegregated college in Michigan and in segregated black and white colleges in South Carolina. After a 10-week period of attendance, no change in self-concept was found for students in any of the colleges.[225] The short duration of the period of study was perhaps the weakest aspect of the research. Douglas was interested in self-esteem development among 260 black and white students in a Detroit junior high school. Only on school self-esteem did blacks score higher than whites.[226] In other aspects of self-esteem—social and home—no differences were apparent. Douglas stresses that black self-esteem is established and maintained by comparison with other blacks. (Presumably, the school in question was predominantly black. As in other cases, levels of self-esteem are local characteristics; they are sustained by comparisons within a restricted group on the premises rather than on a global scale.) In the main, Douglas found no evidence of a distinctive black self-concept.

Trowbridge and the Soarses explored the relation of self-concept to socioeconomic status and, in the former case, race. Trowbridge studied 3,789 third through eighth graders in 42 Iowa elementary schools. Self-concepts of black children exceeded those of white children and children with a lower socioeconomic status had higher self-concepts than children of a higher status. In general, while socioeconomic factors seemed much more important than race, Trowbridge noted that a dearth of middle class black children made it impossible to decide the question with reference to blacks.[227] She also reported the preliminary findings of an ongoing study which demonstrated that lower class self-concept levels were not confounded by IQ. (This contrasts with the judgment of Entwisle and Greenberger that sense of personal control—an important facet of self-concept—very closely resembles intelligence.[228]) The Soarses also found that the self-concepts of disadvantaged elementary and high school students were higher than those of advantaged students. In addition, self-concepts in elementary school were higher for both groups than self-concept levels in secondary school. Their tentative explanation is that both advantaged and disadvantaged students suffer in the transition to high school since they leave a neighborhood school and attend a more competitive and less secure high school.[229] This approach confuses much that should be kept apart. If competition is heightened in high schools, as is plausible, in what sense do "winners" and "losers" suffer alike? In contrast, St. John's orientation seems much more appropriate: It is not the competition but the disparate outcomes of competition that affect self-concept.

During 1970, Jacobson studied the possible impact of black power beliefs upon self-concepts in a nonsegregated junior high school in Chapel Hill, N.C. An experimental task was created and the study occurred outside the classroom. In general, black students favoring black separatism tended to compete better with white students. For example, they feared competition less than did students called "assimilationist" by the researcher. On the other hand, Jacobson sensed an overall conviction by black students that the competition was too unequal. The greatest anxiety was shown by the better black students. Jacobson seems to have drawn the conclusion that black students cannot succeed in any academic competition with whites. He writes: "To bring black students into a biracial situation without insuring that their performance will equal that of their white counterpart, or at least that they will be judged on their own performance and not that of their white counterpart will also affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."[230] It should be emphasized that these conclusions were not based on a study of actual classroom behavior but on an experimental ball-tossing task, performed by biracial pairs of students. Jorgensen's study, discussed earlier, presents a very different perspective, based on classroom conditions. Empirical materials based on direct classroom conditions, as reported by Lipton, yield much greater confidence in the ability of black students to achieve academic success and greater self-confidence in interracial settings.[231]

In a study of 215 10th-graders in what seems to have been University City, Mo., Powers and associates reported that self-images of 49 black students exceeded those of 60 non-Jewish whites but not those of 106 Jewish white students. The researchers hold that this finding is evidence against the hypothesis that black self-image necessarily suffers in a nonsegregated school.[232] In another study, Friend and Neale found that black fifth-graders felt equal to white peers in ability and effort but did not regard these factors as very important in their lives; they reported less self-pride than their white peers.[233]

French studied the effect on lower class black self-concept of varying racial composition in 15 elementary schools in Tallahassee and Monticello, Fla. The schools were grouped as follows: Predominantly white (one-third or less black), racially balanced (one-third to two-thirds black), and predominantly black (more than two-thirds black). French found that the children's feeling of academic adequacy did not depend on the racial composition of the school, thus contradicting the finding of Jacobson. Self-concept seemed to thrive in the two extreme conditions rather than in the middle one. As French summarizes: "Lower class black children attending predominantly black schools scored the highest of the three groups on . . . (a) teacher-school relationships, (b) autonomy, and (c) language [while those lower class black children] in predominantly white schools scored the highest . . . on . . . (a) physical appearance, (b) interpersonal adequacies, (c) physical adequacy and body build, and (d) social adequacy among peers."[234] No suggestion was made by French to explain the apparent nonsignificance of the racially balanced condition.

Beers studied self-esteem of over 3,000 black and white fifth-graders in 110 Pennsylvania schools. Since about half (49 percent) the questionnaires of black students were incomplete and thus not used, the serious possibility of a biased sample exists. Judging from the available data, Beers reported that black students had higher self-esteem in majority-black schools than in majority-white schools.[235] (Later in this chapter, another study by Beers reports on opposite results as a consequence of desegregation in Harrisburg.) White students in barely interracial schools (less than five percent black) had higher self-esteem than in schools which had more than one-quarter black students. In Atlanta, 400 black students lived in nonsegregated areas and attended either of two neighborhood high schools, the one a quarter black in composition, the other 40 percent. Half the students were classified as advantaged, and half as disadvantaged. On a test of 29 items the advantaged students registered a higher self-concept on 19 of the items.[236]

Rosenberg and Simmons examined self-esteem of white and black children in 26 Baltimore schools. The total sample consisted of 2,625 students ranging from 3rd to 12th grades; each one of the children was interviewed for 3 hours. No difference was found between self-esteem of black and white children. This held true when socio-economic status and age were held constant. As discussed earlier in this chapter (see pp. 132), the researchers hold that segregation operated so as to protect the self-esteem of black students. "It is . . . only when black children are integrated that they learn directly what it means personally to be a member of the minority . . ."[237] (This view fails to consider a great mass of contrary evidence that documents the development of racial self-concept by very young minority children. Studies relating to this topic are discussed on pp. 161-169.) Black aspirations are as high or higher than those of whites. But, add Rosenberg and Simmons, these self-attitudes are inflated beyond the possibility of fruition. The degree of inflation is more or less proportionate to the strength of the wish to avoid the unpleasant reality of low social status. Yet, the researchers also report that black students in non-segregated junior and senior high schools actually earn higher grades than blacks in segregated schools. Thus, the prospect and reality of competition with whites have had no deleterious effect on black students. Academic gain must be weighed against lowered self-esteem. The scale of the lowering is called by the researchers neither trivial nor massive.[238]

Strang studied 964 black and white fourth and eighth grade children in six schools of Birmingham, Ala. Black children as a whole had higher self-concepts than white children. Black self-concepts were equally high in racially balanced schools (half black, half white) and in predominantly black schools (70 percent or more black). Eighth graders in the racially balanced schools had significantly more positive self-concepts than all other grade groups. Self-concept of white and black were most comparable in such schools. Black students from the racially balanced schools also "had a significantly more positive self-concept on the home-parents and school-academic elements than did groups from other predominantly black or white settings."[239] A puzzling aspect of this research and that of French is the contradictory significance of racially balanced schools in the two studies. In Strang's study, their influence on black self-concept was strongly positive; in French's study, however, they had no apparent effect.

Wash studied self-concepts of black students in three Los Angeles schools. One was segregated (over 75 percent black), while the other two were integrated (blacks constituted between 10 and 40+ percent; each of the schools was at least one--quarter white). The latter schools were integrated by busing and by virtue of being in an integrated neighborhood. Highest levels of academic self-concept were recorded by upper social class children in the black school and by lower class children in the integrated neighborhood schools.[240] Poorer children were benefiting somehow from what might be called the most secure form of integration–i.e., where both neighborhood and school were integrated. Black children from more well-to-do families managed to have their academic needs met in the segregated school. (In the same school, poorer black children registered the lowest self-concept.) Wash suggests that higher self-concept for middle class children in the segregated school reflected a greater stability of the school and the possibly stronger racial self-identity at that school. It is difficult to see, however, why the poorer black students at the same school would not benefit from these supposed advantages.

Two important studies by Powell were published in 1973. In the first she dealt with 775 black students in Nashville, New Orleans, and Greensboro, N.C. Self-concepts of black students in segregated and desegregated schools did not differ. In addition, self-concept of black students exceeded that of white students in the same cities. Powell attributes the relatively high self-concept to the student's identification with "a powerful, proud black community" (Nashville) or one in which "one can find solace and comfort" (New Orleans). Blacks in desegregated schools maintain their high self-concept not because of the desegregation process but because they conceive of themselves as part of the black community. Powell does not state that desegregation in principle is incompatible with high black self-concept. Rather, she emphasized the dubious character of the desegregation under the existing circumstances. At the time the data were collected, desegregation was extremely limited; 83 percent of black children in the South attended all-black schools. Of the eight desegregated schools studied in detail, none was integrated in any meaningful sense, according to Powell. Black self-development is "hampered by present-day techniques of school desegregation in hostile white racist communities . . ."[241] It would be difficult to deny the force of her conclusion, given the wealth of empirical documentation available elsewhere. In any event, the Powell study of black self-concept is the most complete available in the mid 1970's. Many detailed analyses of the three cities are included in this study and should be consulted for their substantive as well as methodological value.

In a shorter study by Powell, two cities are analyzed. Although they are unnamed, they may possibly be Nashville and Minneapolis. In the southern city, black student self-concept is higher than that of whites. In the northern city, there is no significant difference between the two. Blacks score at a considerably lower level in the North than blacks do in the South. In both sections, white students register a very low self-concept level. ". . . It would appear" concludes Powell, "that black children in a southern city have a way of overcoming that black children in a northern city have not attained . . . The capacity for the southern black students to overcome, as it were, is facilitated by a strong cohesive black community which has some power base in terms not only of numbers but also of achievement."[242]

Busk and associates studied 696 white and black sixth, seventh, and eighth graders in six Chicago parochial schools. While self-concept did not differ between races, it did vary according to racial composition of school. Self-esteem was highest among black students in the three integrated schools (53 to 59 percent black).[243] In a suburb of New York City, Samuels found no difference in self-concept between lower class blacks and whites or middle class blacks and whites. She did, however, find that self-concept of middle class blacks exceeded that of lower class blacks.[244]

Of the 34 studies of self-concept in conditions of interraciality, 17 showed black self-concept to be as high or higher than white self-concept; in 7 cases, self-concept was equal between the races; and in 10, black self-concept was as low or lower than that of whites.

SELF CONCEPT AND DESEGREGATION

In this section, studies that involve a definite desegregation process with a specific starting date are examined.

Meketon studied the impact of desegregation upon the self-esteem of Negro children.[245] The 89 fifth and sixth grade Negro students were in three schools, as follows:

School	Total enrollment	Percent Negro	Number of Negroes in sample	Location
School A	821	100	29	Norwich
School B	416	30	29	Norwich
School C	586	22	31	Burwyn

Students were matched comprehensively; a control group for children in school A was also matched. It is important to note that schools B and C had desegregated under very different circumstances. In B, desegregation had taken place on administrative initiative; no demonstrations nor public pressure had come from the organized Negro community. In C, however, desegregation had come as a direct consequence of prolonged and bitter public controversy, involving debates and demonstrations by the Negro community. School A, of course, was still segregated.

Two principal hypotheses were presumed:

1. The Negro child's performance will be adversely affected by the process of school integration . . .
2. . . . Forced competition with a group considered to be "superior" will negatively affect the child's feelings of self-esteem.[246]

The findings contradicted both hypotheses. The predicted significant differences did not appear in the data. Various other hypotheses and subhypotheses fared differently.

As between school A and school B, children at the form (segregated) school scored significantly higher on the self subtest, a partial test of self-esteem. Negro children at the peacefully desegregated school B did not have significantly higher self-esteem scores than children at the tumultuously desegregated school C. Indeed, children at the latter school had significantly higher self-esteem scores than children at school A. Teachers at all three schools were asked to make certain judgments about the children: ". . . School C teachers evaluated their students as possessing higher levels of self-esteem than did either of the other two schools, and in schools A and B, teachers found more evidence of defensive behavior than did teachers in school C."[247]

Why did Negro students at school C hold up so well? Meketon suggests that the explanation lies with the salience of family and home for these children. Among the factors contributing to the high morale of school C children were:

> The support and sympathy of a close-knit Negro community, national encouragement represented by legal counsel from NAACP, and Supreme Court decisions. Negro community morale, together with the obvious fact that integration had been accomplished to a large extent on their own [parents'] terms, must have served as a source of encouragement to the children. Victories for Negroes in their exchanges with whites are infrequent.[248]

Several Negro teachers worked in school C and they proved a valued refuge for the desegregated Negro children. In school B, on the other hand, the entire community support aspect was absent. Also, not a single Negro teacher worked in school B.

Student anxiety, which Meketon had originally thought would undo the desegregated child, did not have this consequence: "The child," observed Meketon, "is remarkably adaptable and flexible, and given the right circumstances can overcome many of the detrimental aspects of integration."[249] Parental support, she adds, is crucial: "Parental understanding and consideration when the child fails scholastically in his competition with his white peers or meets with rebuffs will help counteract the child's feeling of guilt and inferiority."[250]

The Meketon study is a surprisingly close affirmation of the work of clinician Robert Coles.[251]

In Florida, Negro students who desegregated a high school experienced a drop in self-concept as compared with Negro students who remained in the segregated school. Several special factors may have operated to help bring about this unusual feature of a desegregated situation. A great deal of conflict continued between Negro and white students with nonacceptance of the Negro being the rule. The whole integration experience in the community was "an anxiety-producing phenomenon." Academically, the Negro students had a difficult time. A number of the students were militants whose first interest was trailblazing. Guidance counselors reported that in the second year the black entrants were students "who performed on a higher academic level and whose incentive to integrate was to avail themselves of better educational opportunities."[252]

Harootunian and Morse studied self-concept among Negro students in Kent County, Del. Compared were an all-Negro school and a formerly white school recently desegregated by the free choice method. Negroes in the desegregated school had higher self-concept scores and sense of fate control than did Negroes in the segregated school.[253] The researchers criticized the freedom-of-choice technique of desegregation:

> On the one hand Negro students are placed in a position of asking for something that is rightfully theirs; on the other, the departure of the most able and strongest personalities tends to isolate even further those who do not desegregate. The empirical evidence from our study impresses us with the folly of any kind of partial or quasi solution to the problem of school desegregation.[254]

One possible drawback of this study is that the researchers were unable to tell whether the desegregation plan selected students of high self-concept or whether the desegregation experience engendered higher self-concept.[255]

Garth studied self-concepts of Negro students in Louisville.[257] He compared 44 Negro students who transferred to a heretofore all-white junior high school with 50 Negro students who chose to remain in all-Negro school. Transferees had higher IQ scores and grade point averages though the groups were comparable in socioeconomic status. (The higher IQ scores for transferees were accounted for by girls' scores; the boys did not show this difference.)

Transferees tended to be less favorable in self-concepts and were more severe in self-criticism. Garth states that the transferrees "consistently describe 'Integrated High Schools' and 'White People' relatively favorably on the evaluative dimension and they score 'Negroes I know' and 'Lower Class People' as relatively impotent."[257]

In Jonsson's study of Berkeley, discussed earlier, it will be recalled that he compared three groups of children: (1) Target children: Those enrolled in schools in poverty areas of the city; (2) bused children: Those who had been enrolled in target schools but were bused to nontarget schools, mainly middle class white; and (3) non target children: Mainly middle children, some of whose schools served as receiving schools for the bused children. Jonsson first compared target with non-target children and found that the target children "differentiated their responses less from item to item."[258] The implication is that target children were somewhat rigidly defensive in their self-concept. Bused children, only 13 in number, responded very differently:

> . . . They differentiated their responses from item to item much more than did the pupils of the target school, and showed no tendency to have a positive response set . . . An equally marked difference is in the number of negative item averages for bused pupils . . . The bused children consistently rated themselves less positively on achievement-related items than did the target pupils and, fairly consistently, a little lower than did the non-target group.[259]

It will be recalled that Jonsson earlier reported that the bused students' academic gains, while modest, exceeded expectations.

Claye made an early study of the effect of desegregation on self-concept in three Arkansas schools. While he designated two schools as segregated and another as integrated, he gave no data as to the cities in which they were located nor the color composition of the nonsegregated school. His findings did not support his expectation that the desegregated white students would show a positive growth in self-concept and that they would develop more positive attitudes towards Negroes. Claye noted that the political atmosphere was most unfavorable for measuring interracial attitudes inasmuch as the Little Rock school crisis occurred at that time.[260]

Stinson studied the effect of desegregation upon basic intergroup attitudes.[261] A sample of 833 Negro and white students in 13 schools located in a large southern city was tested in September, 1962 and February, 1963. His findings: "Positive perceptions of others' self-acceptance increased for the desegregated group while perceptions of the segregated group on the same variable decreased. There was greater similarity in the perceptions of Negro and white students than in the perceptions of segregated and desegregated students."[262] Virtually no indication is given of what concrete classroom experience might have produced these results. Taylor studied desegregation effects on self-esteem in a Delaware school. After 1 year of desegregation, Negro self-esteem scores were significantly higher than a year earlier in a segregated school.[263] Interestingly, the scores receded somewhat between the fall and spring test and retest. Taylor attributes this development to the "changing national interracial climate" during 1965-1966.

Caplin's study (discussed earlier) found that Negro children in a desegregated school, matched on socioeconomic status with children in a segregated school, had higher self-concept scores.[263] This was especially true of school-related self-concept, which is in turn closely related to school achievement. On personal-related self-concept, no significant differences obtained between children in segregated and desegregated schools. McWhirt, of the University of South Carolina, observed in a southern city that a school year of desegregation increased self-concept of Negro girls and white boys.[265] Bartee examined self-concept among Negro students in an all-Negro college (Bishop College) and in a recently desegregated white state college (East Texas State University). Two findings are relevant: (1) Neither group showed low self-concept and (2) Negro students in the desegregated college had higher self-concept scores than those in the all-Negro college.[266] It is not altogether clear that the two groups were closely matched.

A two-city study of high-achieving black high school students was done by Morris. Two schools—Central in Detroit and Turner in Atlanta—were segregated. Pershing, in Detroit, was an integrated school serving a largely integrated neighborhood; its black and white students were comparable in socioeconomic status. The entire sample comprised 660 students. High achievers from Pershing were somewhat better adjusted than those in the other schools. High achievers at Turner proved to be more anxious about tests than their peers at Central and Pershing. Morris interprets this finding as an indication that "the high achievers of Turner High uncomfortably sensed their minoirty status."[267] High achievers fared differently, largely in accordance with specific school setting:

> At Pershing, the integrated Detroit high school, the high achievers showed the highest mobility expectations in both educational and occupational areas, followed by Central in occupation and Turner in education. Attending a school which was integrated or Northern was accompanied by occupational mobility expectations; being in an integrated one was found with educational mobility expectations.[268]

Morris suggests that at Pershing, a qualitatively different spirit characterized relations of students and teachers. Also, since the Pershing neighborhood was integrated, it is difficult to separate effects that are attributable to integrated schooling from those attributable to integrated housing.

The reader will have noted the sharp contrast between findings of Morris and Powell. Basic data for the two studies were gathered within a few years of each other: Morris's, in 1966; Powell's, in 1968-69. Atlanta resembles Nashville and Greensboro in many respects, especially in that there are several black colleges in all three cities. Also, their black communities—or, at least, the upper crust—are comparatively well-organized. All three black communities have long traditions of intellectual, business, and civic activity. Powell examined eight desegregated schools—all more or less desegregated on a token basis. Morris studied only a single desegregated school, but one which was "naturally" rather than "tokenistically" desegregated. Ultimately, therefore, the differences between the Morris and Powell studies result from different objects of study rather than clashes over the fate of black children under segregation and desegregation.

Three studies of places in Florida are available. Starnes worked with fourth, sixth, and eighth graders, matching students in desegregated and segregated schools in the northwestern part of the State. He found that students in desegregated settings were superior in achievement and did not manifest any greater anxiety than their peers in segregated schools.[269] Walker studied 104 black and white students in two Dade County junior high schools. The children had spent sixth grade in a segregated school and seventh grade in a desegregated school. Over the 2-year period, the self-concept of lower class black students increased.[270] During their second year of desegregation, however, the self-concept of middle class black students dropped. Walker treats this self-devaluation as a response intended to demonstrate to white students that some blacks—in this case, the middle class children—are really worth socializing with. In the process of acknowledging the lack of acceptability of most other black students, the middle black students absorbed the negative racial attitudes of white students at the school.

Edwards studied the effect of desegregation on anxiety and self-esteem of 783 black and white fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in Mannatee County. Children were tested before being transferred from their one-race school and 6 weeks after the transfer. In the pretest, black students who were to be transferred were more anxious than their peers who were to remain. After the transfer, the anxiety levels of black girls registered high although no consistent effects were felt by black males. In general, black self-esteem was equal to that of whites. It should be noted, however, that white resistance to desegregation in Mannatee County was led by the then Governor of the State who, for a time, defied court orders. Threats of violence against black children were not uncommon. Under such circumstances it is no wonder that the children grew anxious. Edwards suggests that greatest fear was not for their self-esteem but simply their safety. Even granting this, Edwards asserts, a problem remains:

> The black younster is caught in the dilemma of being as "good", but not able to perform as well in school as his white peer. Repeated experiences of this conflict could result in higher. . . [anxiety] without necessarily reducing self-esteem, which is bolstered by black pride.[271]

In a supplementary study of a school in Leon County, Edwards found that anxiety levels bore no significant relationship to socioeconomic status. This was not always found in other investigations.

Aspects of self-concept and desegregation have been studied in three places in Texas. Evans traced changes in achievement and self-concept over a year of desegregation in six schools. Black children in the desegregated schools achieved at a slower pace than their peers in a segregated school. Their self-concept also dropped relative to the same peers. Evans implied that staff in the desegregated schools were not responding to the educational challenge of desegregation:

> New combinations of ethnic and minority group children in classrooms offer teachers and professional educators stimulating and unusual opportunities to foster personal growth of all children. The data collected and presented in the . . . study do not indicate that these opportunities are being utilized or recognized.[272]

Rayson compared anxiety levels among three small elementary schools in East Texas. In the one integrated school, test anxiety was higher for black students than for peers in an all-black school.[273] In a study of seven schools in Fort Worth, Ghee found rising self-concepts by black students in both integrated and segregated schools. The increase was greater in the latter. In commenting on the absence of more beneficent effects of desegregation, Ghee observes, very much as Evans:

> Inclusion of white teachers in segregated [Black] classrooms is not enough for the cause of desegregation. Teacher attitude will have to improve as well as student attitude . . . In collecting the data, the experimenter felt that the educational stimulation and opportunities which teachers and others should afford students are not being presented, utilized, or recognized.[274]

Unfortunately, neither Evans nor Ghee proceeded to discuss this matter in any detail.

The results of three studies in California are of some interest. In San Francisco, after less than a single semester of attendance in desegregated schools, black and other non-white third graders increased their self-concept scores. The reverse occurred with sixth graders. Spanish-surnamed students in both grades decreased in self-concept. The school district was at a loss to explain any of the changes. It was noted that self-concept stood at a generally high level at the outset and did not change very much in absolute terms.[275] A suggestion was made to study the actual school program to discover any clues to help explain specific outcomes. It is not known whether the suggestion was followed. Krenkel studied 675 students in an intermediate school (fourth, fifth, and sixth grades). From an examination of actual classroom configurations of work and play groups, she discovered no self-concept differences among black, Asian, and white students. A certain degree of segregation on ethnic grounds was, however, discernible.[276] In Riverside, as reported in the preceding chapter, minority children who went through the desegregation experience tended to talk less freely. In initial tests, Bikson and associates found no "language deficit" for minority children.[277] Indeed, they found the very opposite. Yet, desegregation narrowed the language advantage of the same children. It is tempting to infer a lowered self-concept from these events. The question is touched on in the next two chapters. next two chapters.

Two studies of Illinois cities have been made, one of Kankakee, the other of Evanston. Kuhn, in the former, found that black fourth and fifth graders in a newly desegregated school had higher self-concepts than their white peers.[278] Hsia found that black students in Evanston declined in academic self-concept after desegregation. With respect to sense of personal control, however, no changes were reported.[279]

Bridgette studied self-esteem in a small semi-rural community in North Carolina. A distinctive feature of the research was that the black students under study had led agitation in the community to desegregate the high school. Black students registered only slightly lower on self-esteem than did white students 3 months after entering the school. Bridgette suggests that attainment of their goal of desegregating the school heightened their sense of self-worth and worked against any wholesale downgrading of self-esteem.[280] In a study of 40 black tenth graders in Mobile County, Ala., James found no difference in self-concept between 15 who had volunteered to enter a predominantly white school and 25 others who had been assigned to the same school by court order. A third group of 96 black students who had chosen to remain in predominantly black schools also recorded a self-concept level equal to that of the other two groups.[281] This testing covered a year's time.

Shaw studied desegregation in a small southern city over a period of 2 years. With respect to self-concept, he found:

> There was no evidence that changes in self-perception of blacks were any different from the changes in the self-perception of whites . . . There may be an initial negative effect on the self-perception of both blacks and whites, but the long term effects appear to be negligible or even positive for both groups . . . The data . . . call into question the hypothesis that the self-concepts of blacks become less positive when they become pupils in an integrated school.[282]

In another southern city, Williams and Byars found that the self-esteem of black 11th graders was positively affected by desegregation. The largest positive effect, however, was felt by black students taught by white teachers who had volunteered for the assignment. These teachers, guess the researchers, had liberal racial views. This observation led Williams and Byars to conclude that "the optimal approach for enhancing Negro self-evaluation . . . [may be] to transfer whites to Negro schools."[283] (For statistics on the number of white students in minority schools, see chapter 6, Table 3.) The Mahans, after a 2-year study of Hartford, Conn., reported minority children in the schools of five suburbs scored several important cognitive gains. These gains, they observe, "do not seem to have been achieved at any measured loss of vitality or expressiveness; in fact, the opposite seems more likely."[284] Another 2-year study, this one at Harrisburg, Pa., recorded rises in black self-esteem and interest in school following desegregation.[285]

SUMMARY

Out of 26 studies, a negative or positive effect of desegregation on self-concept or self-esteem might be observed, 12 found the effect was positive; 3 no different from whites or blacks in segregated schools; 8, the effect was lowered self-concept; in 2, black students in both segregated and desegregated settings experienced comparable increases; and in 1, all experimental groups experienced rising self-esteem.

To provide a more comprehensive view of the self-concept phenomenon, the foregoing figures are combined with those on page 155, relating to interraciality and self-concept, as follows:

Type of Study	Setting	
	Interraciality	Desegregation
1. Number of studies evidencing a positive effect on the self-concept of black students	17	12
2. Number of studies evidencing a negative effect on the self-concept of black students	10	8
3. Number of studies evidencing mixed effects on the self-concept of black students	7	6
Total	34	26

These figures warrant a strong denial of the frequently heard statement that black self-concept suffers when blacks and white children attend the same school. The weight of the evidence supports the proposition that attendance at an interracial school benefits black children's self-conceptions. It should be recalled (pp. 146-148) that of the six studies of self-concept and segregation, in only one case did black students register a higher self-concept than white children; in two cases, they scored lower; and in three cases, they were equal.

Certain themes recur frequently in the self-concept studies, especially those in which a negative effect emerged. Often, there is implication that negative effects result from actions or inactions of the school. School policy or teachers may be singled out. A number of times, the *laissez faire* policy of a school is equated with a non-concern by school authorities. In one community after another, where the advent of desegregation came only in the train of sharp conflict, the school tends to heave a sigh of relief rather than gathering its intellectual and human resources for new ventures.

Recently, an emphasis has appeared in the research literature on the need to approach self-concept through cognitive functioning. More than a decade ago, Erikson warned:

> . . . Children cannot be fooled by empty praise and condescending encouragement. They may have to accept artificial bolstering of their self-esteem in lieu of something better, but . . . their accruing ego identity gains real strength only from wholehearted and consistent recognition of real accomplishment . . .[286]

More recently, Epps has expanded on Erikson:

> If we accept the position that one of the goals of educational programs is to provide opportunities for each individual to enhance his/her self-esteem and develop the feeling that he/she is a person worthy of esteem, it would seem to follow that such a program would provide all persons with opportunities for successful acquisition of the skills needed for later educational and occupational attainments.[287]

"Self-esteem programs" that teach children to console themselves for the lack of academic skills are exceedingly harmful. The cynicism that creates such programs can only enlarge the existing gap between the school and minority communities.

Finally, note should be taken of one implication of the generally constructive effect of interraciality and desegregation in relation to self-concept of black children. Since constructive educational experiences are more often sought out than stumbled upon, it follows that a number of teachers and principals have contributed importantly to positive self-concept outcomes. This general subject is discussed in chapter 9.

RACIAL SELF-AWARENESS

In a racist society, the race of a child–and of his or her parents–is of towering significance. This fact does not easily escape children, To the black child, it has a special importance. The avenues whereby black children learn about race have been matters of research since about 1940.

The Clarks conducted a series of studies reported between 1939 and 1950. Their subjects were Negro preschool children in Washington, D.C. and New York City. In Washington, the children participated in segregated programs; in New York, some were in a Negro group and others in a mixed group. Only the Washington sample, it was noted, was large enough to yield dependable conclusions. The Clarks used dolls and crayons to elicit racial self-conceptions from the young children.

Negro children, given two choices of identifying with a white or a Negro doll, tended to choose the white doll.[288] Choice of the Negro doll was more frequent in the all-Negro nursery schools. In any event, age was directly related to choice of the Negro doll.[289] Light-skinned Negro children chose Negro dolls less frequently than did dark-skinned Negro children. The Clarks explained their findings by contending that "consciousness of self as different from others on the basis of observed skin color precedes any consciousness of self in terms of socially defined group differences in these Negro children."[290] To the youngsters, "light Negro" skin most resembled "white" skin; "dark Negro" skin was sharply different from both other hues. Thus, the Clarks interpreted the young children's color consciousness as not equivalent to race consciousness.

Did integration retard the Negro child's self-awareness and racial identification? The small size of the Clarks' integrated sample precluded a definite answer. More research would be needed, they agreed.[291]

Evidence derived by the Clarks from the children's crayon work led to similar conclusions. By age 5, "the Negro child . . . is aware of the fact that to be colored in contemporary American society is a mark of inferior status."[292] The Clarks distinguished between racial self-awareness and racial preference: " . . . By the age of 7 the Negro child cannot escape self-identification, but many . . . indicate a clear-cut preference for white . . . "[293] They called for "a definite mental hygiene and educational program that would relieve children of the tremendous burden of feelings of inadequacy and inferiority . . . "[294] All but a tiny percentage of these Negro children attended segregated schools.

Radke and associates studied racial self-awareness among primary-grade children in the public schools of Philadelphia. Using the doll technique, she found that 89 percent of the white children preferred the white doll while 57 percent of the Negro children chose the Negro doll. Also evident was the children's awareness of some of the social concomitants of race in America.

"...Part of the children's concepts of race include the factors of occupations, clothing, and housing."[295] In five schools studied, the percentage Negro ranged from zero to 100. White children overwhelmingly rejected Negro children, whether any were actual classmates or not. Nevertheless, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children, when asked whether a Negro boy in a picture was glad to be a Negro, replied in the affirmative.[296] At the same time, Negro children indicated ambivalent feelings toward self-identification as a Negro.

At the Ruggles Street Nursery School in Boston, Mass., Goodman studied 27 Negro and white children, ranging in age from 2.9 years to 4.4 years. She reported: "None of the subjects . . . had yet developed true race attitudes, but all gave evidence of slight to full awareness of their own racial identity and that of others."[297] The Negro children seemed more sensitive to racial matters and hesitated more to discuss them. Yet, Goodman observed that "most of the subjects . . . do not manifest reluctance toward cross-racial hospitality."[298]

Powell studied racial awareness among 4-year-olds in a majority-Negro nursery school located on the campus of a predominantly Negro college.[299] While the number of children was small (11 Negro and 4 white), a rewarding study was conducted. Children were asked to choose dolls, fit together different colored pieces of a puzzle made up of family members, and arrange play groups around a set of miniature life toys. The white doll was preferred by 76 percent of the Negro children, thus indicating that the general cultural preference for white had already been absorbed. On the other hand, Powell emphasized that racial awareness was most unstable among the children. As for behavior in the nursery school, she reported that "Negro and white children in the research group play as much with peers of the other race as they do with peers of their own race."[300] As benign as relations were, however, racial differences did crop up from time to time. Powell was led to observe that "interracial groups even at the preschool level cannot be effective in accomplishing their aims unless teachers take an active part in helping children to understand and accept racial differences."[301]

Butts, a psychiatrist at the Hillcrest Center in Bedford, N.Y., observed in 1963 that black children aged 9-12 at the virtually all-black treatment institution were impeded in the development of inner security by "the tendency to measure personal worth by the degree of proximity to white complexion."[302] Those children with lower self-esteem also tended to misperceive themselves in terms of skin color.

Gregor and McPherson studied racial attitudes in two segregated schools in the Deep South. Subjects were 83 white middle class students and 92 Negro lower class students. In a doll exercise, 95 percent of the Negroes identified with the Negro doll and about half preferred the doll over a white doll.[303] In several respects, these results compared with those found by Radke in integrated and segregated schools in Philadelphia. Also, it is not clear what impact the difference in socioeconomic status had on the findings of Gregor and McPherson. The researchers raise the question of whether segregation might not have a beneficial effect on racial self-identification.[304]

Stabler and associates examined race attitudes of 67 Negro and white children in Head Start and public school classes. Working with responses to identification of black-bad and white-good, the researchers concluded that "the racial attitudes of the larger society have been incorporated by preschool children of both races, but by white children more so than by Negro children."[305]

The hair area of human figure drawings was studied by Frisch and Handler as a clue to racial self-attitudes. It had been noted in the past that in such drawings by Negro children, "the hair area was grossly overemphasized and distorted."[306] Drawings were collected from a sample of 122 Negro and 103 white children of similar economic background. Two judges, who did not know the youngsters, were highly successful in distinguishing which drawings had been done by a white or Negro child. In the great predominance of the drawings by Negro children the ratio of hair area to face area was significantly larger. The researchers interpreted their finding as "a cultural reflection of the Negro's desire for assimilation and integration."[307]

Dennis analyzed the changing racial composition of drawings by students at Howard University in 1957 and 1967. In the earlier study he could discern no Negro characteristics in the drawings. In the later study, about 18 percent of the figures were unmistakably Negro.[308] Dennis speculated that the increase probably occurred during 1965-67, a period of upsurge of black nationalist sentiment. An indication of a parallel development is contained in a study of Howard University students by Bayton and Muldrow. The researchers tested the ability of light-skinned and dark-skinned Negro students to take each other's role. They concluded:

> . . . Light-skin Negro males occupy some psychologically marginal status which makes them especially responsive to skin color cues emanating from other Negroes. Furthermore, they see dark Negroes as having more desirable personality characteristics than light Negroes possess. The data further suggest that light-skin Negro males are somewhat "uncomfortable" in their position vis-a-vis dark Negroes.[309]

The results of both these studies become more understandable in view of the growth of "blackness" sentiment on the campus of Howard University during these years.

Greenwald and Oppenheim sharply reduced the percentage of Negro nursery children who misidentified their race. This was accomplished by using a "mulatto" doll in addition to a white and a dark brown one. In the Clarks' northern sample, studied in 1939, 39 percent of the Negro children misidentified themselves; in the more recent study –data for which were collected in 1961–the percentage declined to 13.310 (The Clarks' 1939 study was done in New York City; the 1961 study, in New York City and New Rochelle, N.Y.) Greenwald and Oppenheim conclude that Negro children do not misidentify their race more than white children do. Apparently one possible explanatory factor was not explored by the researchers: the Clarks' northern sample was an all-Negro group and a very small integrated group–the latter too small to yield any dependable conclusions. The more recent study may have involved integrated nursery schools. This might have contributed to the changed findings. A noteworthy feature of the Greenwald-Oppenheim research is its finding that white children misidentify their race to a much greater extent then Negroes (44 percent and 13 percent). Finally, despite the accuracy of Negro self-identification, Negro children still preferred to play with the white rather than the mulatto or dark brown doll.

Asher and Allen studied race preference in a largely segregated sample of 341 Negro and white children in Newark, N.J. The settings were not schools. Using puppets instead of dolls, the researchers found a uniform preference of white and rejection of brown puppets by both Negro and white children.[311] It was noted that there were no statistically significant differences between the outcomes of this research and of the Clarks' study. Asher and Allen, however, erroneously state that the Clarks' northern sample was integrated. (See p. 161) In a study of race drawings by Negro and white adolescents in Northern Virginia, Wise found that "70 percent of the Negro and 80 percent of the white adolescents reported that the figure they had drawn was 'white'."[312]

Two reports of racial awareness of white children in North Carolina are of interest. Studying 60 5-year-olds in Charlotte, Diamant found that the children were conscious of racial differences but were unprejudiced. They were asked to make "families" of a combination of white and Negro dolls. Diamant found that the "children of 5 years who were of normal intelligence did not refrain from calling a Negro child doll a child of white white doll parents, regardless of parental attitudes towards civil rights."[313] Diamant speculated that at age 5 the gestalt of the family proved too strong to be overcome by the counterforce of racial prejudice. Williams and Edwards studied 84 5-year-old middle class white children in Winston-Salem. Procedures were used to affect the children's tendency to identify the color black negatively and white positively. The result was that "children whose black-white concept attitudes had been weakened subsequently showed somewhat less tendency to evaluate Negroes negatively and Caucasians positively."[314]

Morland compared race awareness in Boston and in Lynchburg, Va. He matched 4 groups of 41 Negro and white children, ages 3 to 6. A majority in each group preferred whites over Negroes. White self-identification exceeded Negro self-identification. The white model was especially strong among southern children: southern whites were more race conscious than northern whites, and southern Negroes were significantly more likely to prefer whites.[316] Morland holds that "preference for one race . . . did not mean rejection of the other race, for the great majority in the four groupings accepted members of both races when no choice was required . . ."[317] He acknowledges that this interpretation is at odds with previous studies.[318]

Fundamentally, observes Morland, America is racist although it need not remain so:

> . . . American society as it now operates teaches that racial differences are very important and that being white is preferable to being Negro. Under such conditions young Negro children probably learn to prefer and identify with the dominant race . . . The results of this study on race awareness in young children suggest that as the sociocultural milieu in American changes, such awareness will change.[319]

Which–Negro or white–would change first, Morland did not say.

Morland also conducted a comparative study of race awareness among 450 Hong Kong Chinese and Negro and white American children, ranging in age from 4 to 6 years. While both Hong Kong and the United States are multiracial societies, in the former the Chinese are of parallel, not subordinate, status to the British. In the U.S., of course, the Negroes and whites are in a subordinate-superordinate power relationship. Morland set out to discover whether racial awareness of children responded to these differences. "The great majority of respondents," according to Morland, "accepted both their own and the other race."[320] Negro children while tending to accept their race also showed more conflict over race identity. The Chinese children were more self-accepting and less stressful about the matter. This, Morland held, was to be expected inasmuch as "in such a society there is no dominant race to maintain its superior position and no subordinate race to show unconscious preference for and identification with the dominant race."[21] To Morland, the study suggested that when American society changes so that Negroes cease being subordinate, "the racial preference and racial self-identification of Negro children will change."[322]

It may be of some interest to examine the relationship of race consciousness and attitude toward persons of another race from an adult perspective. Noel studied this relationship among 515 adult Negroes.[323] The subjects were divided into two classifications, with reference to ethnic identification: (1) Identifiers who had a positive identification with Negroes as a group, and (2) disparagers who had a negative identification. Noel found that "Negroes who are militantly identified with the minority group are consistently more favorably inclined toward integration, both in attitude and action, than are Negroes who disparage the in-group."[324] In other words, those who felt *most Negro* were likely to be least anti-white. Ethnic consciousness need not necessarily become ethnocentrism.

Noel explored the relationship of ethnic identification to "defensive insulation." Respondents who accepted the following proposition were classed as believers in defensive insulation: "It is best to stay away from white people; then you will avoid all embarrassing situations." The following table reports the data:

Ethnic Identification and defensive insulation

Believe in Defensive Insulation	Among 515 adult Negroes Identifiers percents	 Ambivalents percents	 Disparagers percents
Yes	16	18	56
No	84	72	44
	(N=229)	(N=180)	(N=106)

The significant difference among respondents points up the socially constructive function of ethnic consciousness. What Noel calls "positive group identification"[325] is precisely what Singer described as Negro children "differentiating themselves."

Since the late 1960's, there has been an extraordinary expansion in the number of studies of race consciousness of black children. In part, the trend is merely a continuation of past interest. It is also a response to what might be called more broadly, the black power movement.

Krystall and associates found that black high school students in Montgomery, Ala. favored both integration and black consciousness.[326] Hoetker and Siegel tested racial attitudes of high school students in Los Angeles by asking students who had seen a series of professionally produced plays to "cast" an imaginary play, drawing on the black and white actors. Black students selected black actors much more frequently than did the Anglo, Mexican American, and Asian students. However, the latter groups also chose blacks to a disproportionately high degree. The researchers note that while black students have become more racially oriented, the "young whites have become much less sure about the place that non-whites should be kept in."[327] A rare study of changing racial self-conceptions was conducted by Goering in Kinloch, an all-black community in St. Louis County, Mo. A racial self-awareness test that had been taken by high school students in 1950 was administered again in 1970, at the same school. Goering found "a decreasing aversion to dark skin among black youths and a fairly universal acceptance of natural hair type over pressed, treated hair."[328] Yet, older negative attitudes continued their hold, as Goering notes: "A marked increase in the tolerance of black youths for variations in color and facial features among blacks has not radically affected the undesirability of the most stereotypic Negroid facial features."

Banks reported changes between 1957 and 1967 in racial attitudes of students at a predominantly black university. Greater acceptance of blackness had become evident but the students had also become more accepting "of the negative cultural stereotypes about white people."[329] Racial self-attitudes of 2,809 blacks in 15 cities were studied by Edwards; respondents ranged in age from 16 to 69 years. The researcher found that ". . . blacks of darker complexion have a greater awareness of racial discrimination and hostility on the part of whites, have a greater sense of racial or ethnic identification, and more frequently report negative racial experiences."[330] An interracial "jury" of children and adults judged photographs of black and white faces as attractive or not. The Crosses found that while black judges generally gave higher ratings of beauty, the entire sample judged whites as more attractive than blacks.[331]

Evidence suggests that black self-acceptance is increasing. It is also clear that many negative self-attitudes persist. Perhaps these latter are but lingering influences of past times. One way of judging this is to review studies of younger children who were born when more recent ideologies of racial equality were taking hold.

Studying a small sample of 23 largely middle class black preschool children in Philadelphia, Floyd found a high degree of self-recognition regarding race. Black children seemed to prefer white over black, even in choice of "mothers" through selection of photographs. A modest positive correlation existed between the child's desire to be or choose white and the parents' belief in black power ideology. Floyd acknowledges that he did not use a control group.[332]

Stapleton sought to discover whether the presence of a black teacher would affect the racial awareness of black children in a Chicago preschool. He found no effect.[333] In Murfreesboro, Tenn., Strain studied 60 black and white children, aged 4 to 7 years, in integrated classrooms. The test consisted of photographs of black and white persons. Stapleton found that white preferences for the "white" photographs increased with age; black children—whose preferences were similar—did not orient more strongly toward whites as they grew older. White racial bias emerged earlier. Asked to express preferences for photographs of black and white children with "sad" or "happy" faces, black children were more positive toward the "black" photographs.[334]

McAdoo compared racial self-awareness among black preschool children in Mississippi and Michigan. Mound Bayou, the southern town, is an all-black community where all businesses are black-owned and -operated. The Michigan children lived in Inkster and Dearborn Heights, suburbs of Detroit. Average age of the children was 5½ years. While the southern children were better able to identify their race and the races in general, both groups of children tended to value white figures more positively than black figures. The children demonstrated attitudes that perplexed McAdoo.

She wrote:

> It is difficult to conceive of a child placing low value on one of the physical characteristics upon which he is classified, i.e., race or sex, and at the same time have a high concept of himself. Yet this appears to be the case with many of the children in this sample.[335]

This same phenomenon has, of course, been reported elsewhere in this chapter.

Hraba and Grant studied racial self-awareness of black children living in an overwhelmingly white area—Lincoln, Neb. They found 89 black children, aged 4 to 8 years, preferred a black doll to a white one, contrary to the finding of the Clarks nearly 30 years earlier. Also unlike the earlier study, Hraba and Grant found that black children of light skin color chose a black doll no less frequently. While nearly all the black children had many white friends, they had not become white oriented in their racial preference.[336]

Two studies concerned the possible role of race in the empathy of young children toward one another. Klein, who dealt with 128 black and white first and second graders in Inglewood, Calif., found different racial patterns. Black children were equally empathic with black and white children, while white children were less empathic with black than with other white children. Statistically, however, moderate support was found for the proposition that empathy tended to follow racial lines.[337] Meltzer studied empathic behavior of 90 white kindergartners, second and sixth graders. Race of victim bore no relation to the readiness of the white child to help the victim.[338]

Koslin and associates studied racial self-awareness of 120 first and second graders in three schools: one was all-white; one, all-black; the third half-white and half-black. Attendance at the balanced school did not affect attitudes of either group of children. White children strongly preferred pictures of white classrooms rather than pictures of a predominantly black classroom. Choices of the black children were highly variable and fell into three groups: 42 percent chose white classrooms two-thirds of the time; 35 percent chose black classrooms two-thirds of the time; and 23 percent had no consistent preferences. "The first and second grade children," conclude the researchers, " . . . were by no means insensitive to race."[339] Steigelmann, studying 42 black boys aged 7 to 14 years, found a distinct tendency among them to misperceive their racial identity.[340]

One of the outstanding studies in this area was published in 1971, although its data were gathered in 1965. Porter, studying kindergartens and nursery schools in Boston, worked with children 3, 4, and 5 years old. She viewed racial self-awareness and preference in a context of age, sex, social class, intergroup contact, and skin color. On the whole, many black children, according to Porter, "either wish that they were white or at least are ambivalent toward the fact that they are Negro."[341] Social class conditions this self-attitude importantly. Working class children, for example, recorded the highest *racial* self-concept, middle class children, the lowest. Children whose mothers were on Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) were nearer the working class. On the other hand, middle class children have higher *personal* self-esteem than working class children. Porter relates these class differences to the position of blacks in American society at large. Thus, the black middle class has a marginal status, and its children orient more toward white society. Working class blacks, while economically dependent on white employers, have few social contacts with whites and are more strongly involved in black community institutions.

Young children learn to think racially all too soon. As Porter writes:

> . . . For 4- and 5-year-olds of both races and for 3-year-old Negroes, white [doll] preference has some racial connotation. The choices of the white 3-year-old group, however, do not indicate racial evaluations.[342]

By age 5 years, the children may be said to have definite racial attitudes. When they enter the first grade, their "opinions about race are fairly well formed."[343]

Desegregation, according to Porter, "does not seem to have a negative effect on the racial self-concepts of working and middle class children."[344] Light-skinned and dark-skinned children respond differently to the desegregation setting: The former tend to exhibit more white preference in doll selection while the latter choose brown dolls more frequently. In any event, however salient race may be for some areas of behavior, Porter's subjects paid it little heed when choosing partners for play.

The schools in Porter's study were desegregated but hardly integrated. Teachers seemed consciously to avoid affirmative intervention on racial matters. Porter wrote:

> . . . While the data were being collected, I was struck by the lack of attention to racial matters in perhaps the majority of the desegregated classrooms. Many teachers seemed to assume that it was improper to deal with race in this age group . . . The attitudes of the children either were left to develop with no countervailing pressures or were reinforced in some classrooms by subtle factors introduced by teachers or curriculum that communicated that white is better than black.[345]

Porter implies that organized teacher planning could help reinforce nondiscriminatory patterns and reduce negative self-evaluations.

Adair studied the racial self-attitudes of 72 black children in a Detroit area day care center. He found girls to have a clearer self-identification as black than boys. But while boys' black self-identification rose with age, that of girls remained level. Racial self-identity did not rise with age, a finding that is at odds with a number of other studies.[346] Kircher and Furby found in a study of 30 preschoolers in a non-segregated setting that while black 4-year olds preferred white skin (on a test), 5-year olds showed no preference. Contrariwise, 5-year old white children increased their preference for white.[347] Sçiara observed that 70 fourth graders, all but a few black, tended to identify light adult Negroes with high-status occupations and dark adult Negroes with low-status occupations.[348]

Ethnic identification and preference data for 170 white, black and Mexican American Head Start children in Southern California were studied by Rohrer; 88 were in non-segregated settings; and 82, in segregated settings. Across both settings, 43.1 percent of the black children misidentified their race. Most of the misidentification was a product of the segregated setting where only 38 percent identified with their own group. In the non-segregated setting, the corresponding figure for correct self-identification was 81.8 percent.[349] Preference data, on the other hand, showed a strong tendency by black children away from their group. They chose white and Mexican American children more often than other black children. Rohrer comments bitingly: "Although they hear 'Black is beautiful,' these black children know it is better to be brown and even more beneficial to be white."[350]

Beginning in 1953, children in two New York City kindergartens became the subjects of a longitudinal study which lasted over 10 years. One school in Brooklyn, attended primarily by lower middle class children, was 85 percent white; the other, on the edge of Harlem, was 85 percent black and lower middle class for the most part. Kraus, who became the chronicler of this unusual group, recounts:

> . . . Each year from 1953 to 1960, children had been asked to draw pictures of themselves or of anybody. During this time not one black or Puerto Rican or white child added color to the face in his drawing. In 1972, the writer asked 25 white teachers and 5 black teachers to have their classes draw pictures of themselves, giving children the identical instructions used in our study. Of the 170 black children, 96 blackened their faces. Of 164 Puerto Rican children, 24 darkened their faces . . . . [Of] the 50 Oriental children . . . almost all drew Oriental features and 21 darkened their faces . . . .[351]

Kraus adds that student drawings did not vary with the race of the teacher.

Ward and Braun, studying 60 black 7- and 8-year olds in Chester and Media, Pa., found that a majority selected a black puppet over a white one, and that those who made more color (black) preferences tended also to have a higher self-concept.[352] Doke and Risley, however, found that sex differences were significantly more important than race in choice of friends. The children, only 12 in number, lived in an all-black neighborhood and their ages ranged from 4 to 12 years.[353] Palmer studied 80 white children in Hagerstown, Md. He found that 4-year-olds who lived in a nonsegregated neighborhood chose black more frequently than predicted. No such trend was shown among 8-year-old children from the same neighborhood. Palmer surmised in explanation that "perhaps . . . the preference trends of the 8-year-olds in question have been influenced strongly by school attendance."[354]

Datcher and associates found in a racial self-identification study of three schools in Chicago suburbs that 88.3 percent of the black children preferred a black doll over a white one. Attendance at a segregated or nonsegregated school made no difference; nor did the race of the teacher.[355] Banks and Rompf studied 60 middle class black and white children in the San Francisco Bay area. Racially appropriate self-drawings were made by 87 percent of the black children. The same children, however, still tended to reward white "winners" in a game more frequently than black "winners". When the children were asked to express an evaluative judgment of the players that was divorced from winning or losing, they chose black players markedly more often.[356] Rogers found high levels of racial pride among black children attending schools of varying racial composition. The level was lower in a segregated than in two nonsegregated schools. Since socioeconomic levels were considerably lower in the segregated school, Rogers acknowledges the difference between both types of schools might be socioeconomic in nature, at least in part.[357] Kelley also studied children in schools of varying composition in Rochester, N.Y. In general, she found a high degree of racial self-identification among black children and a minimum of black children who wanted to be white. The strongest evidence of racism and separatism was found in the segregated white and black schools. Students in the nonsegregated school tended more readily to accept children of a race other than their own.[358] They also tended to reside in an area that was fairly nonsegregated.

Hauser conducted a long term psychoanalytic study of 22 poor black adolescent males in New Haven, Conn., between 1962 and 1967. The boys did not evince any desire to be white. But a number hated themselves and held themselves in very low esteem. Throughout the years of the study, reports Hauser, constant themes in the interviews "were the Negroes' degraded self-estimates [and] the scathing judgments . . . .The themes of worthlessness, undesirability, and uselessness recurred in many contexts."[359] Hauser speaks of a social process of "victimization" that aggravates the negative self-feelings. Prominent in this process are ever-present limitations on real choices and alternatives in schooling, residence, recreation, and job. As a consequence, the sense of identity of the young men seemed to Hauser to be foreclosed–without any prospective development. Thus, without reference to the role of the school, Hauser views the identity foreclosure as fundamentally an offshoot of white society.

A few studies have explored techniques of modifying negative self-racial attitudes as well as racially prejudiced behavior toward others. Spencer and Horowitz experimented with variously colored mechanical puppets with some degree of success.[360] Katz has taken seriously the traditional injunction that racial prejudice may be deeply rooted in early experiences of a child. She found that nursery school children had trouble discerning differences among faces of a race other than their own and that highly prejudiced children tended more to see other-race faces as similar than did children with low prejudice. Working with nursery, kindergarten, second-, and sixth grade children, she was able to train children to distinguish more accurately between individuals of races other than their own.[361]

Even a cursory review of the racial self-concept studies discussed in this section documents the greater readiness of black children to assert their acceptance of being black. But what is the social-psychological significance of these test findings? Not very much, according to Dr. Mamie P. Clark who, with her husband, Kenneth B. Clark, conducted one of the earliest series of studies in this area. (See p. 161). In 1974, she told an interviewer:

> . . . From my general observations, the children's perception of themselves as black and all the negatives that connotes have not changed significantly since my first studies in the late 1930's and 1940's. If there is any improvement in the self-image of black children, it would be among those growing up in the South today. . . .[362]

(Dr. Clark has for many years headed the Northside Clinic for Children in Harlem.)

Spurlock, a psychiatrist, is another skeptic. She conducted a doll study with normal black children aged 4 to 9. They strongly oriented toward the white dolls. Spurlock wrote:

> The findings of the study were highly suggestive that the mouthing of the beauty of Blackness by many Black children is a reaction formation . . . . This characteristic appears most frequently among those children from lower socioeconomic groups; that is, they react by saying that Black is beautiful, but they do not really feel it as being so.

In explanation, Spurlock suggests:

> . . . These youngsters are more consistently exposed to more forcibly racist and rejecting experiences than are other children. These are the children who attend overcrowded schools and who may frequently hear from their teachers (black and white) comments implying that "they can't learn," "don't want to learn," and/or "all" ADC children are just alike.

At the same time, Spurlock acknowledges that many black children have derived from the "Black is beautiful" slogan "a positive feeling of unity, peer acceptance, and protection against the onslaught of a hostile world."[363]

Over the past generation, the basic racism of American society and its educational institutions has continued to stand. Children's drawings and doll choices are striking enough evidence of this. At the same time, black Americans have created a national movement, led by blacks, for equality. Both racism and resistance filter in and out of the self-consciousness of black Americans. An underestimation of the former leaves children, especially, defenseless. Hauser stresses this facet. But an overestimation of the resistance has the same effect. M. Clark and Spurlock make this point.

Similarly, segregation, while not necessarily inconsistent with high racial self-identification, is by no means a guarantor of self-racial acceptance. Indeed, the balance of research strongly suggests that under conditions of interraciality, black self-acceptance and acceptance of white are high and go hand in hand. It is also clear from the studies that schools have a large area for affirmative action in the creation of an accepting and productive educational climate for all children.

BLACK STUDIES

Some 40 years ago, the sociologist Charles Johnson urged that the education of black children take account of their intimate experience and be realistic in approach. He complained, too, of the "blocking-out" of black history from the Negro child's schooling.[364] Little evidence exists that schools enrolling black students have turned noticeably more realistic in their curriculum or have based their instruction on the intimate life of black children. A number of schools, however, have incorporated one or another aspect of what is known as black studies; most frequently, this means black history. These experiences have been evaluated to some extent.

In Escambia, Fla. Bass studied effects of a 16-week Saturday morning seminar. Children in a nonsegregated attendance group seem to have actually declined in understanding as a result. Meanwhile, members of a segregated group gained measurably.[365] In Denver, 216 black and white kindergartners were asked to express their preference for stories with black and white characters. The children, no respectors of science, liked *all* the characters. Most said they would like the characters to be their friends and attend their birthday parties. The children were 6 years old on the average; they attended predominantly white or black schools, a fact that did not affect their story preferences.[366] In 1968 Roth experimented in Pontiac, Mich., with a curriculum in which the life and history of black people formed an integral part. Black students who studied this curriculum developed significantly greater black pride—black students in nonsegregated settings more than those in segregated classes.[367]

In Denton, Tex., a 15-week program of instruction in grades two through six resulted, according to Manning, in a significant gain of students' self-concept over those who did not participate in the program.[368] Smith utilized a black studies curriculum component with fifth and sixth graders in Pontiac. The academic self-concept of the experimental group grew significantly more positive. Unlike Roth's study, Smith confined his work to a single segregated school. "Like many compensatory education programs," commented Smith, "the experimental program evaluated here was a 'mile wide and an inch deep.'"[369] McAdoo tried to change black preschoolers' racial attitudes by three techniques. Children attended preschools in Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti, and Dearborn, Mich. Some small changes were brought about in racial self-attitudes but none in racial preferences. Black children continued their orientation to white choices.[370]

After a walkout of black students from Lincoln High School in San Diego in 1969, a black studies program was installed. Matthews evaluated the program and found no effects attributable to it. In a test of possible effects on self-concept, those who did not take the program scored higher than those who did. This bleak picture led Matthews to recommend that "educational systems should discontinue the practice of including black studies in the school curriculum as a tool to soften demands by blacks for change."[371] Almost completely opposite results were obtained by Andrews in an experiment in Ryan Elementary school in Scotlandville, La. Positive gains were demonstrated for factual knowledge, self-concept, and school readiness. Unfortunately, no control group was used and socioeconomic factors covered a very wide spectrum, making it difficult to hold this factor constant.[372]

Yee and Fruth found that black studies produced a significant achievement effect.[373] Grant, using similar materials, found no effect on self-concept.[374] Mezz failed to find a hoped-for effect of attitudes toward school (education) in a junior high school in Phoenix, Ariz.[375] In a study in Baltimore, some slight positive self-concept effects were found for black studies courses for high school seniors. Fisher, the researcher, was skeptical of the academic potential of these courses, at least in the form they were offered. This led him to conclude that "it is not educationally sound to present the Negro students and the Negro community yet another 'built-in' failure on the part of the schools."[376] Hunigan summarized his study of three Illinois cities: "... One hour of black-pride training a day does not seem to keep the white preference away."[377]

An informed impression of what transpired in the classrooms during the black studies instruction does not seem to emerge from the research. The reports dwell at length on statistical analysis of data, but contain little about the pedagogy of black studies.

CONCLUSION

To be black and oneself in a racist society is a major undertaking, especially for children. The family is the first educator in this matter. But the schools can—at least, potentially—follow closely behind. Evidence suggests, however, that in most cases, the schools have not done so. Instead, they have, in Fanon's phrase, been busily decking black faces with white masks.

Black children aspire to a better world for themselves. By and large, they hope to attain as much or more material success than whites. The greatest barriers are not an incapacity to dream but an inability to overcome obdurate social practices of a discriminatory character. Career opportunities for college educated blacks have expanded dramatically while hundreds of thousands of young black people in the cities remain locked within a narrow circle of employment possibilities. Aspirational levels continue to rise. Acute awareness of discriminatory practices leads to a conviction that forces outside the individual are primarily responsible for the low socioeconomic status of blacks. Researchers see this orientation as realistic and thus functional for adaptation of black youngsters to their world.

Under desegregation, vocational and educational aspirations become more realistic which some observers interpret negatively as a drop in aspirations. Research evidence is scanty but indications are that attendance at desegregated schools benefits the adult job and other achievement.

What happens to black self-concept as a whole in school? In segregated schools there is a tendency for self-concept of black children to be lower than that of whites. This is not always the case, however. Under conditions of interraciality—i.e., attendance in the same school but without indication of the circumstances leading to such common attendance—black children tend to have a self-concept as high or higher than that of white children. In desegregated schools, fewer than a third of the studies demonstrated a decline in black self-concept.

Racial self-awareness has apparently increased sharply, both in the North and South. Racial self-acceptance has also undoubtedly risen. But the degree of such a rise has been overstated. So far, the practice of black studies in elementary and high schools has not yielded many examples of success.

Nearly all the studies reviewed in this chapter are subject to at least two limitations. First, they were conducted either in segregated or tokenly desegregated settings. Full-scale exploration of desegregation effects in the area of self-concept has hardly begun. Second, the "experiments" are usually confined to changing the racial composition of the classroom or the school. Teaching methods and school organization remain the same. Implicitly, this assumes that existing methods and structures are conducive to educational growth.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Frederick Douglass to William Lloyd Garrison, January 27, 1846, reprinted in *Liberator*, February 27, 1846.

[2] Jane Ellen McAllister, "Childhood As I Remember It," *Integrated Education*, 11(July-October 1973), p. 25.

[3] Richard Wright, *Black Boy. A Record of Childhood and Youth* (New York: Harper and Row, 1945), p. 216.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 283.

[6] See Horace Mann Bond, "Self-Respect as a Factor in Racial Advancement," *Annals*, 140 (1928), p. 23 and Oliver C. Cox, *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959, orig. 1948), p. 441.

[7] Frances Cress Welsing, "The 'Comspiracy' to Make Blacks Inferior," *Ebony*, 29(September 1974), p. 85.

[8] Daniel W. Edwards, "Blacks versus Whites: When Is Race a Relevant Variable?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29 (1974), p. 47.

[9] Jacquelyne Johnson Jackson and Viola Elizabeth Jackson, "Needed: Personalized Modes of Learning," *Educational Leadership*. 30(October 1972), p. 20.

[10] Morris Rosenberg and Roberta G. Simmons, *Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child* (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1972), pp. 24, 26.

[11] Mildred R. Buck, "Self-Esteem as a Relevant Psychological Factor," *Contemporary Psychology*, 19(1974), p. 49.

[12] June Jackson Christmas, "Self-Concept and Attitudes," p. 249 in Kent S. Miller and Ralph M. Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States* (New York: Seminar Press, 1973).

[13] Ruth C. Wylie, *The Self-Concept*, Rev. ed. Vol. 1: *A Review of Methodological Considerations and Measuring Instruments* (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1974), p. 31.

[14] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, tr. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove, 1967), p. 8.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 202.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 148.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

[19] David P. and Pearl Ausubel, "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children," in Harry A. Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), p. 118.

[20] James S. Coleman, *Race Relations and Social Change* (Baltimore, Md.: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July, 1967), p. 31.

[21] Rayford W. Logan, "Educational Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education* (January 1933), p. 65.

[22] James N. Morgan and others, *Five Thousand American Families–Patterns of Economic Progress*, Vol. I: *An Analysis of the First Five Years of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1974), pp. 335-336.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 339.

[24] Norman Miller, *Riverside School Study: Summary and Conclusions*, 1974, unpublished, p. 21.

[25] Andrew F. Brimmer, "Education and Income in the Black Community," *Integrated Education*, 11 (November-December 1973) p. 5.

[26] Murray Milner, Jr., "Race Education, and Jobs: Trends, 1960-1970," *Sociology of Education*, 46(1973), p. 296. See also, Finis Welch, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," *American Economic Review*, 63(December 1973), pp. 893-907 and Leonard Weiss and Jeffery G. Williamson, "Black Education, Earnings, and Interregional Migration: Some New Evidence," *ibid.*, 62(June 1972), pp. 372-383.

[27] Paul Bullock with Jacobo Rodriguez, *Aspiration vs. Opportunity: "Careers" in the Inner City* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1973), p. 3.

[28] Task Force on Employment Problems of Black Youth, *The Job Crisis for Black Youth* (New York: Praeger, 1971).

[29] David Rogers, "Vocational and Career Education: A Critique and Some New Directions," *Teachers College Record*, 74(1972-1973), p. 478.

[30] Herbert Robinson, Jr., principal of Douglass High School, quoted in David Vincent, "The Uneducation of Black Students," *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, March 28, 1970.

[31] See, for example, Suzanne Keller and Marisa Zavalloni, "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," *Social Forces*, October, 1964.

[32] G.F. Boyd, "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 1952; Committee on Race and Education, *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools* (Portland, Oreg.: Board of Education, October 29, 1964) p. 122.

[33] Regina M. Goff, "Some Educational Implications of the Influence of Rejection on Aspiration Levels of Minority Group Children," *Journal of Experimental Education*, December 1954, p. 181.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[35] Eunice S. Grier, *In Search of a Future. A Pilot Study of the Career-Seeking Experiences of Selected High School Graduates in Washington, D.C.* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, January 1963), p. iv.

[36] Charles B. Nam, A. Lewis Rhodes and Robert E. Herriott, *Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Educational Differences in the Population* (Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, May 1966), p. 57.

[37] Elias Blake, Jr., *A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1960) (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616).

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[41] Alan B. Wilson, *The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960), See, also, Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," *American Sociological Review*, December 1959.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[47] Paul N. Geisel, *I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison* (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962). (University Microfilms Order No. 63-1838)

[48] *Ibid.*, pp.64-5.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[50] *Ibid.*, p.283.

[51] *Ibid.*, p.211

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 280.

[53] James G. Maddox with E. D. Liebhafsky, Vivian W. Henderson, and Herbert M. Hamlin, *The Advancing South. Manpower Prospects and Problems* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967), pp. 144-145.

[54] Aaron M. Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in An Integrated University*, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965), p. 47.

[55] Geisel, p. 284.

[56] Harold S. Goldblatt and Cyril Tyson, *Some Self Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro, and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th Grades*, Research Report No. 12 (New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962).

[57] Christus N. Powell, *Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama* (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963). (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5382)

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 89.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[62] Noel P. Gist and William S. Bennett, "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces*, October 1963.

[63] Geisel, p. 279.

[64] Gist and Bennett, p. 44.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[66] Geisel, p. 210.

[67] David Gottlieb, "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents," unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964. See, also, Gottlieb, "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class. But It's Not Easy," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, October 1967.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[72] Robert G. Brown, "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research*, May-June 1965.

[73] Donald E. Meeks, *Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effects of Race and Social Class on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys* (Doctoral dissertation, Smith College, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-907).

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[77] Leonard F. Sain, *Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 119).

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 112.

[79] *Ibid.*, footnote 2, p. 172.

[80] William R. Odell, *Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education.* Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

[82] Nancy Hoyt St. John, "The Effect of Segregation in the Aspirations of Negro Youth," *Harvard Educational Review*, Summer 1966.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 286.

[84] Faye J. Goldberg and Gloria Cowan, "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Figures," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, March 31, 1966.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[86] M. Richard Cramer, Charles E. Bowerman and Ernest Q. Campbell, *Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966.)

[87] *Ibid.*, II, p. 350.

[88] Carolyn F. Huson and Michael E. Schiltz, *College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differences in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, July 1966).

[89] *Ibid.*, p. XIX.

[90] Joseph H. Fichter: *Young Negro Talent–Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November 1964); *Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative*

Exploration of the Expectations and Experiences of College Graduates of the Class of June 1961 (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, January 1965; and *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967).

[91] Fichter, *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges*, p. 52.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 154

[93] Fichter, *Young Negro Talent*, pp. 37 and 54. See also, Andrew F. Brimmer, "Employment Patterns and the Dilemma of Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, October-November 1967, and "Education and the Economic Advancement of Minority Groups." *Integrated Education*, March-April 1970.

[94] Fichter, *Young Negro Talent*, p. 62.

[95] Fichter, *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges*, p.211.

[96] Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes* (Tuskegee Ala.: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March 1967).

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[98] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[99] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[100] Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashshur, and Gary W. Shannon, *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis* (Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

[101] *Ibid.*, p.50.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[103] On specific school policies, however, considerable controversy exists. See, for example, National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Detroit, Michigan. *A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunity in a Large City* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, March 1967) and Karl D. Gregory, "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," *New University Thought*, Spring 1967.

[104] Franks, *Some Social Determinants of Academic Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children*, p. 53.

[105] Bilquis A. Alam, *Perception of Opportunity and Occupational Expectations: Racial Comparison of Rural Youth*, April 1968 (ERIC #ED 021 663).

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[107] Hyman Rodman and Patricia Voydanoff, *Social Class and Parents' Aspirations for Their Children*, August 1968, p. 11 (ERIC #ED 030 482).

[108] Joseph Veroff and Stanton Peel, "Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25 (1969), 82-93.

[109] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

[110] *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

[111] George Henderson, "Role Models for Lower Class Negro Boys," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 46(1967-68) 7 (emphasis in original).

[112] Ruth C. Wylie and Edwin B. Hutchins, "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspiration as a Function of Socio-economic Level, Race and Sex," *Psychological Reports*, 21 (1967) 799.

[113] Joseph L. Carwise, *Aspirations and Attitudes Toward Education of Over- and Under-Achieving Negro Junior High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-4711).

[114] Kurt Robert Durig, *A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 95. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2283).

[115] Claiburne Burnice Thorpe, *Status, Race, and Aspiration. A Study of the Desire of High School Students to Enter a Professional or a Technical Occupation* (Doctoral dissertation, New School for Social Research, 1968), p. 40. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 870).

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[117] Morris Daniel Caplin, *The Relationship Between Self Concept and Academic Achievement and Between Level of Aspiration and Academic Achievement* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 284); same author, "Self-Concept, Level of Aspiration, and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Negro Education*, Fall 1968.

[118] Capline, *The Relationship Between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement*, p. 68.

[119] Albert Lewis Rhodes, *Effects of Parental Expectations on Educational Plans of White and Nonwhite Adolescents*, September 1968, pp. 151, 155. (ERIC ED 027 096).

[120] *Ibid.*, p. 10

[121] Kent G. Mommsen, "Valuation of Alternative Success Means by Race, Sex, Ability and Socioeconomic Status," appendix C in Rhodes, p. C14.

[122] Donald E. Allen and Oliver W. Robinson, *Some Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Public Assistance Students*, 1969, p. 27 (ERIC ED 029 747).

[123] Byron William Curtis, *The Effects of Segregation on the Vocational Aspirations of Negro Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968), pp. 71-72. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 605).

[124] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[125] Patricia Gurin and Daniel Katz, *Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College*, November, 1966, p. 143. (ERIC ED 010 537).

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

[129] Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, Rosina C. Lao, and Muriel Beattie, "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(1969) 53.

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[131] Carl Christian Jorgensen, *The Socialization and Meaning of Sense of Internal and External Control Among*

Black High School Students (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 25.

[132] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

[133] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[134] Kinnard White, "Belief in Reinforcement Control Among Southern Negro Adolescents: The Effects of School Desegregation, Socioeconomic Status, and Sex of Student," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 85(1971), p. 150.

[135] Mildred R. Buck and Harvey R. Austrin, "Factors Related to School Achievement in An Economically Disadvantaged Group," *Child Development*, 42(December 1971), p. 1823.

[136A] Doris R. Entwisle and Ellen Greenberger, *A Survey of Cognitive Style in Maryland Ninth-Graders: III Feelings of Control Over Academic Achievement* (Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, August 1970), p. 10

[136B] Doris R. Entwisle and Urry Webster, Jr., "Raising Children's Performance Expectations," *Social Science Research*, 1 (1972), pp. 147-58.

[136C] "Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups," *Sociology of Education*, 47 Summer 1974), p. 135.

[137] Arthur Cosby, "Black-White Differences in Aspirations Among Deep South High School Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, 40 (Winter 1971), p. 21.

[138] Josephine A. Foster, *Variations in Levels of Aspirations of Children Grouped by Class, Race, Sex, and Grade Level* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, 1964), p. 40.

[139] John Williform Eppes, *The Effect of Varying the Race of the Experimenter on the Level of Aspirations of Externally-Controlled Inner City School Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1969), p. 39.

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[141] David M.H. Richmond, *Educational Horizons Among Lower Class Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968), pp. 48-49.

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 60

[143] Fern Belle Brindley, *Social Factors Influencing Educational Aspiration of Black and White Girls* (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1970), p. 99

[144] Gerda Lorenz, "Aspirations of Low-Income Blacks and Whites: A Case of Reference Group Processes," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (September 1972), p. 388.

[145] Judith S. Brook, Martin Whiteman, Estelle Persach, and Martin Deutsch, "Aspiration Levels of and For Children: Age, Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Correlates," *Journal of General Psychology*, 124 (1974), pp. 12, 15.

[146] Edward E. Abramson, "Levels of Aspiration of Negro 9th Grade Males in Integrated and Segregated Schools," *Psychological Reports*, 29 (1971), p. 258.

[147] John Arlis Hall, *The Influence of School Desegregation on the Work Values and Occupational Aspiration Levels of Twelfth-Grade Negro Males in Texas Public High Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1971), p. 51.

[148] Ansell, *An Assessment of Vocational Maturity of Lower-Class Caucasians, Lower-Class Negroes and Middle-Class Caucasians in Grades Eight Through Twelve* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1970), p. 78. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-22, 099.)

[149] Kinnard White and James H. Knight, "School Desegregation, Socioeconomic Status, Sex, and the Aspirations of Southern Negro Adolescents," *Journal of Negro Education*, 42(Winter 1973), p. 76.

[150] Robert L. Crain, "School Integration and Occupational Achievement of Negroes," *American Journal of Sociology*, 75(1969-1970), pp. 594-595.

[151] Epps, "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality," p. 16.

[152] Rachel T. Weddington, *The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948).

[153] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[154] Marilyn Marie Wendland, *Self-Concept in Southern Negro and White Adolescents As Related to Rural-Urban Residence* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968, p. 62). (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1695).

[155] *Ibid.*, pp. 81 and 103.

[156] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[157] Richard D. Trent, "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, September 1957.

[158] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[159] Bert R. Brown, *The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self Concept Referents Test* (New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966).

[160] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[161] Robert G. Gibby, Sr., and Robert Gabler, "The Self-Concepts of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23(1967), 147.

[162] Barbara H. Long and Edmund H. Henderson, "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 1966.

[163] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[165] Binkley, *First Grade Engrance Variables*, p. 98.

[166] Edward T. Clark, Richard J. Ozenhosky, Anita I. Barz, and John V. O'Leary, "Self-Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April 1967.

[167] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[168] Benjamin J. Hodgkins and Robert G. Stakenas, "A Study of Self-Concepts of Negro and White Youth in Segregated Environments," *Journal of Negro Education*, 38 (1969) 375.

[169] Aubrey Spencer Escoffery, *Personality and Behavior Correlates of Negro American Belief in "Fate-Control"* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1967), p. 82. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1341).

[170] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[171] Sinai Israel Frenkel, *A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures* (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966).

[172] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[173] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.

[174] Robert L. Derbyshire, *Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 098).

[175] *Ibid.*, p. 259.

[176] Bruce L. Maliver, *Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-10,006).

[177] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

[178] Clare G. McArdle and Nancy F. Young, "Classroom Discussion of Racial Identity or How Can We Make It Without 'Acting White'?" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 40 (1970), p. 137.

[179] William F. White and Bert O. Richmond, "Perception of Self and of Peers by Economically Deprived Black and Advantaged White Fifth Graders," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 30 (1970), p. 534.

[180] Bonnie Bullough, "Alienation and School Segregation," *Integrated Education*, (March-April 1972) p. 32.

[181] *Ibid.*

182Henderson, *A Comparative Analysis of Social-Psychological School Climate Variables*, pp. 98-99.

[183] Schneider, *An Investigation of Social-Psychological Variables Comprising School Normative Academic Climate*, p. 121.

[184] Peter L. Bunton and Theodore A. Weissbach, "Attitudes Toward Blackness of Black Preschool Children Attending Community-Controlled or Public Schools," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 92 (1974), p. 58.

[185] Ronald W. Marx and Philip H. Winne, "Self-Concept and Achievement: Implications for Educational Programs," *Intergrateducation*, 13 (January-February 1975), p. 31.

[186] Dorothy G. Singer, *Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools*, (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2836. See, Also, Singer, "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," *Trans-Action, June 1967.*

[187] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[188] *Ibid.*, pp. 99-101.

[189] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[191] *Ibid.*, p. 109.

[192] *Ibid.*, pp. 113-114.

[193] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[194] Warren C. Haggstrom, *Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-359) also, Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," *Integrated Education*, October-November 1963.

[195] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[186] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

[197] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

[198] *Ibid.*, P. 158. (emphasis in original).

[199] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[200] Elsie E. Lessing. "Racial Differences in Indices of Ego Functioning Relevant to Academic Achievement," *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 115 (1969) 161-162.

[201] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[202] Peter John Georgeoff, *The Effect of the Curriculum Upon the Self-Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classrooms*, 1968, p. 7 (ERIC ED 017 020).

[203] Carmen A. Posner, *Some Effects of Genetic and Cultural Variables on Self-Evaluations of Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1969), pp. 72-3, 76. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-9835).

[204] *Ibid.*, p. 98

[205] Fred Guggenheim, "Self-Esteem and Achievement Expectations for White and Negro Children," *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 33 (1969), 67.

[206] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

[207] Blake, *A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration*, p. 69.

[208] Geisel, *I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southin City*, p. 91.

[209] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[210] *Ibid.*, p. 282.

[211] Jane D. Lockwood, *An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes, and Home-Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966) p. 53. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8303).

[212] Thomas R. Carpenter, and Thomas V. Busse, "Development of Self-Concept in Negro and White Welfare Children," *Child Development*, 40 (1969) 938.

[213] Wessman, *Evaluation of Project ABC*, p. 166.

[214] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

[215] Anothony T. Soares and Louise M. Soares, "Self-Perceptions of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," *American Educational Research Journal*, 6 (1969) 37.

[216] LaMar Perry Miller, *An Investigation of Non-Intellectual Factors in the Education of Selected Negro High School Students* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968), p.121

[217] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[218] Wylie and Hutchins, "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations as a Function of Socioeconomic Level, Race, and Sex," pp. 798-799.

[219] *Race and Education in the City of Oakland*, p. 141.

[220] Jerold Heiss and Susan Owens, "Self-Evaluations of Blacks and Whites," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (September 1972), pp. 365, 360.

[221] Maurice Orange White, *Alienation and Self-Esteem as They Relate to Race, Sex, Socioeconomic and School Variables in Urban High School Age Youth* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1963), pp. 132, 135.

[222] J. David Colfax, "The Cognitive Self-Concept and School Segregation: Some Preliminary Findings," p. 109 in William W. Brickman and Stanley Lehrer (eds.), *Education and the Many Faces of the Disadvantaged: Cultural and Historical Perspectives* (New York: Wiley, 1972).

[223] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

[224] Nancy St. John, "The Elementary Classroom as a Frog Pond: Self-Concept, Sense of Control, and Social Context," *Social Forces*, 49 (1970) p. 594.

[225] Oscar Perry Butler, Jr., *A Comparative Study of the Self-Concept of Black and White Freshman Students from the Midwest and South* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 87.

[226] Leonard Douglas, *A Comparative Analysis of the Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Certain Selected Variables Among Youth from Diverse Racial Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), p. 175. See, also by Douglas, "Negro Self-Concept: Myth or Reality? *Integrated Education*, 9 (November-December 1971), pp. 27-29.

[227] Norma Trowbridge, "Self-Concept and Socioeconomic Status in Elementary School Children," *American Educational Research Journal*, 9 (Fall 1972), p. 529. See also, Norma Lamber, and Lisa Trowbridge, "Self-Concept and Socio-Economic Status," *Child Study Journal*, 2 (1972) 123-143.

[228] Entwisle and Greenberger, *A Survey of Cognitive Style in Maryland Ninth Graders*, p. 19.

[229] Louise M. and Anthony T. Soares, "Self-Concepts of Disadvantaged and Advantaged Students," *Child Study Journal*, 1 (Winter 1970-1971), pp. 71-72.

[230] Cardell Klaine Jacobson, *The Effects of Black Power and the Locus of Control Variable on Performance and Self-Deprecation of Junior High School Students in Biracial Pairs* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1971), pp. 71-72.

[231] See Aaron Lipton, "Classroom Grouping and Integration," *Integrated Education*, (February-March 1964) and "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," *Ibid.*, (June-July 1965).

[232] Jerry M. Powers *et al.*, "A Research Note on the Self-Perception of Youth," *American Educational Research Journal*, 8 (March 1971), p.669.

[233] Ronald M. Friend and John M. Neale, "Children's Perceptions of Success and Failure: An Attributional Analysis of the Effects of Race and Social Class," *Developmental Psychology*, 7 (1972), p. 128.

[234] *Jeana Turner French, Educational Desegregation and Selected Self-Concept Factors of Lower-Class Black Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972), pp. 63-64.

[235] Joan S. Beers, *Self-Esteem, School Interest, and Acceptance of Others as a Function of Demographic Catergorization* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972), p. 94.

[236] Clarence Curtis Dixon, *A Comparative Study of the Self-Concepts of Disadvantaged and Advantaged Negro Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972), pp. 113-114.

[237] Rosenberg and Simmons, *Black and White Self-Esteem*, p. 26.

[238] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

[239] William Jacob Strang, Jr., *The Self-Concepts of Children of Elementary Schools with Differing Proportions of Negro and White Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1972), p. 186.

[240] Brenda Dolores Lakin Wash, *The Black Child's Self-Concept: A Study of Ten- and Eleven-Year olds Varying in Sex, Socioeconomic Background and Integrated vs. Segregated School Settings* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 83-85.

[241] Gloria Johnson Powell with Marielle Fuller, *Black Monday's Children: A Study of the Effects of School Desegregation on Self-Concepts of Southern Children*

[242] Gloria Johnson Powell, "Self-Concept in White and Black Children," pp. 313-314 in Charles V. Willie, Bernard M. Kramer, and Bertram S. Brown (eds.), *Racism and Mental Health. Essays* (Pittsburg, Pa.: University of Pittsburg Press, 1973).

[243] Patricia L. Busk, Robin C. Ford, and Jerome L. Schulman, "Effects of Schools' Racial Composition on the Self-Concept of Black and White Students," *Journal of Educational Research*, 67 (October 1973), pp. 60, 621.

[244] Shirley C. Samuels, "An Investigation Into the Self Concepts of Lower and Middle Class Black and White Kindergarten Children," *Journal of Negro Education*, 42 (Fall, 1973), p. 470.

[245] Betty F. Meketon, *The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966).

[246] *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

[247] *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68.

[248] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[249] *Ibid.*, p. 90

[250] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[251] See Robert Coles, *Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967), *passim*.

[252] Millard J. Bienvenu, Sr., *Effects of School Integration on the Self-Concept and Anxiety of Lower-Class, Negro Adolescent Males* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968), p. 52. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 671).

[253] Berj Harootunian and Richard J. Morse, *Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students Prior to Desegregation. A Study of Negro Student's Freedom of Choice*, September 1968, pp. 82 and 107. (ERIC ED 024 745).

[254] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

[255] See also Berj Harootunian, *Self-Other Relationships of Segregated and Desegregated Ninth Graders*, February 8, 1968. (ERIC ED 023 765).

[256] Charles E. Garth, *Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools*, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1968).

[257] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[258] Jonsson, *Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I*, p. 46.

[259] *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.

[260] Clifton M. Claye, *A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro Among Secondary School Pupils in Three Schools of Arkansas* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1958), pp. 87-88.

[261] Harold N. Stinson, *The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students* (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-509).

[262] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[263] Charlotte P. Taylor, *Some Changes in Self-Concept in the First Year of Desegregating Schooling: The Outward Walls and the Inward Scars* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1967), p. 126. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,568).

[264] Morris D. Caplin, "The Relationship between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 37 (1969), 15.

[265] Ronald Alfred McWhirt, *The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration, and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967), p. 29. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,568).

[266] Geraldine McMurry Bartee, *The Perceptual Characteristics of Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students* (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967), pp. 83 and 120. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1128).

[267] Joseph Morris, *Personal Adjustment of the High Achieving Negro Student* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968), p. 138.

[268] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[269] Thomas Albert Starnes, *An Analysis of the Academic Achievement of Negro Students in the Predominantly White Schools of a Selected Florida County* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968), pp. 26, 60.

[270] Kenneth DeLeon Walker, *Effects of Social and Cultural Isolation Upon the Self-Concepts of Negro Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968), p. 140.

[271] Curtis Drew Edwards, *Stress in the School: A Study of Anxiety and Self-Esteem in Black and White Elementary School Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972), p. 61.

[272] Charles Lee Evans, *The Immediate Effects of Classroom Integration on the Academic Progress, Self-Concept, and Racial Attitude of Negro Elementary Children* (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968), p. 84.

[273] Harvey Rayson, *An Investigation of the Anxiety Level of Negro and White Students in an Integrated School, an All-Negro School, and an All-White School* (Master's thesis, Stephen F. Austin State University, 1971), p. 54.

[274] Sandra Faye Ghee, *A Quantative Study of Long Range Effects of Classroom Desegregation on Academic Progress, Self-Concept, and Racial Attitude of Black Junior-Senior High School Students* (Master's thesis, Texas Woman's University, 1972), pp. 37-38

[275] San Francisco Unified School District, *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration 1971-72* (San Francisco, California: San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972), p. 107.

[276] Noele Krenkel, *Self-Concept and Interaction Patterns of Children in a Desegregated School* (Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco, 1972), pp. 28, 46.

[277] Bikson and others, *School Desegregation and Children's Speech*, p. 5.

[278] Kenneth Chester Kuhn, *Self-Concept of Black and White Students Between and Among Social Classes in Newly Desegregated Elementary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1972), p. 83.

[279] Jayjia Hsia, *Integration in Evanston, 1967-71: A Longitudinal Evaluation* (Evanston, Ill.: Educational Testing Service, August 1971), p. 94.

[280] Richard Evan Bridgette, *Self-Esteem in Negro and White Southern Adolescents* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1970), p. 172.

[281] Doyle Hill James, *The Effect of Desegregation on the Self-Concept of Negro High School Students* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1970), p. 55.

[282] Marvin E. Shaw, "The Self-Image of Black and White Pupils in an Integrated School," *Journal of Personality*, 42(March 1974), pp. 21-22.

[283] Robert L. Williams and Harry Byars, "The Effect of Academic Integration on the Self-Esteem of Southern Negro Students," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 80 (1973), p. 186. See, also, Mamie Culbertson, *May I Speak? Diary of a Crossover Teacher* (Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Company, 1972).

[284] Aline M. Mahan and Thomas W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children," *Integrated Education*, 8(January-February 1970), pp. 60-61.

[285] Joan S. Beers and Francis J. Reardon, "Racial Balancing in Harrisburg, Achievement and Attitudinal Changes," *Integrated Education*, 12 (September-October, 1974) pp. 37-38.

[286] Erik H. Erikson, "A Memorandum on Identity and Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues*, 20 (1964), p. 32.

[287] Epps, "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts, and Other Aspects of Personality, p. 8.

[288] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Preschool Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10 (1939).

[289] *Ibid.*, p. 598.

[290] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Skin Color as a Factor in Racial Identification of Negro Preschool Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 11 (1940).

[291] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children: A Preliminary Report," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 8(1939-40), 163.

[292] Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie K. Clark, "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," *Journal of Negro Education*, 19 (1950), 350.

[293] *Ibid.*, p. 349.

[294] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

[295] Marian J. Radke and Helen G. Trager, "Children's Perceptions of the Social Roles of Negroes and Whites," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 29 (1950), 33.

[296] Marian J. Radke, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 40 (1949), 377.

[297] Mary Ellen Goodman, "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," *American Anthropologist*, 48 (1946), 625.

[298] *Ibid.*, p. 627.

[299] Alice Mendham Powell, *Racial Awareness and Social Behavior in an Interracial Four- Year-Old Group* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1958), p. 81.

[300] *Ibid.*, p. 95.

[301] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

[302] Hugh H. Butts, "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," *Journal of Negro Education*, 32(Spring 1963), p. 126.

[303] A. James Gregor and D. Angus McPherson, "Racial Attitudes Among White and Negro Children in a Deep South Standard Metropolitan Area," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 68(1966), 100.

[304] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[305] John R. Stabler, Edward E. Johnson, and Melvyn A. Berke, *The Relationship Between Race and Perception of Racially-Related Stimuli in Preschool Children*, 1967, p. 8 (ERIC ED 030 483).

[306] Giora R. Frisch and Leonard Handler, "Differences in Negro and White Drawings: A Cultural Interpretation," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 24 (1967), 667.

[307] *Ibid.*, p. 669.

[308] Wayne Dennis, "Racial Change in Negro Drawings," *Journal of Psychology*, 69(1968), 130.

[309] James A. Bayton and Tressie W. Muldrow, "Interacting Variables in the Perception of Racial Personality Traits," *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality*, 3(1968), 43-44.

[310] Herbert J. Greenwald and Don B. Oppenheim, "Reported Magnitude of Self-Misidentification Among Negro Children–Artifact" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(1968), 51.

[311] Steven R. Asher and Vernon L. Allen, "Racial Preference and Social Comparison Processes," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(1969), 161.

[312] James H. Wise, "Self-Reports by Negro and White Adolescents to the Draw-a-Person," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 28(1969), 194.

[313] Louis Diamant, "Relationships between Intelligence and Parental Attitudes and Race Awareness in Five-Year-Olds," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 77(1969), 256

[314] John E. Williams and C. Drew Edwards, *"An Exploratory Study of the Modification of Color and Racial Concept Attitudes in Preschool Children,"* Child Development, 40(1969), 748.

[315] J. Kenneth Morland, "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January 1966; see, also, by Morland: "Racial Recogniation in Nursery School Children in Lynchburg, Virginia," *Social Forces*, December 1958; "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, VIII (1962); "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," *American Catholic Sociological Review*, Fall 1963; and "The Development of Racial Bias in Young Children" *Theory into Practice*, II (1963).

[316] *Morland, "A Comparison," p. 29.*

[317] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[318] See, especially, by Kenneth B. Clark and Mamie Clark: (1) "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children," *Journal of Social Psychology*, November 1939; (2) "Segregation as a Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children, a Preliminary Report," *Journal of Experimental Education*, December 1939.

[319] *Morland, "A Comparison," p. 29.*

[320] J. Kenneth Morland, "Race Awareness among American and Hong Kong Chinese Children," *American Journal of Sociology*, 75 (1969), 366.

[321] *Ibid.*, p. 371.

[322] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

[323] Donald L. Noel, "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

[324] Ibid., p. 5.

[325] See, also, Gary Marx, *Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), pp. 196-197, on self-image and out-group hostility.

[326] Eric R. Krystall, Neil Friedman, Glenn Howze, and Edgar G. Epps, "Attitudes Toward Integration and Black Consciousness: Southern Negro High School Seniors and their Mothers," *Phylon*, 31 (Summer 1970), p. 113.

[327] James Hoether and Gary Siegel, "Three Studies of the Preferences of Students of Different Races for Actors in Interracial Theatre Productions," *Journal of Social Issues*, 26, No. 4(1970), p. 102.

[328] John M. Goering, "Changing Perceptions and Evaluations of Physical Characteristics Among Blacks: 1950-1970," *Phylon*, 33(Fall 1972), p. 241.

[329] William M. Banks, "The Changing Attitudes of Black Students," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 48(May 1970), p. 743.

[330] Ozzie L. Edwards, "Skin Color as a Variable in Racial Attitudes of Black Urbanites," *Journal of Black Studies*, 3(June, 1973), p. 482.

[331] John F. Cross and Jane Cross, "Age, Sex, Race, and the Perception of Facial Beauty," *Developmental Psychology*, 5(1971) p. 437.

[332] James A. Floyd, *Self-Concept Development in Black Children* (Senior thesis in Psychology, Princeton University, May 5, 1969), p. 50.

[33] Jack L. Stapleton, *Effect of a Head Teacher's Race on the Race Awareness of Black Headstart Children*, (Master's degree, De Paul University, 1970), p. 36.

[334] Barbara Strain, *Developmental Trends in the Selective Perception of Race and Affect by Young Negro and Caucasian Children* (Master's thesis, George Peabody College, 1970), pp. 27, 32. (Also published by the John F. Kennedy Center for Research in Education and Human Development, George Peabody College).

[335] Harriette Ann Pipes McAdoo, *Racial Attitudes and Self Concepts of Black Preschool Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970), p. 114.

[336] Joseph Hraba and Geoffrey Grant, "Black is Beautiful: A Reexamination of Racial Preference and Identification," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(1970), p. 400. See, also, Hraba, "The Doll Technique: A Measure of Racial Ethnocentrism?" *Social Forces*, 50(1971-1972, pp. 522-527.

[337] Rosalyn Shapiro Klein, *Some Factors Influencing Empathy-in-Six- and Seven- Year Old Children Varying in Ethnic Background* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970), pp. 52, 60.

[338] Carole Garner Meltzer, *The Effects of Age, Race of Victim, and Ability to Take Another's Role in Helpfulness and Sharing in Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1970), p. 35.

[339] Sandra Cohen Koslim, Marianne Amarel, and Nancy Ames, "The Effect of Race on Peer Evaluation and Perference in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Negro Education*, 39 (Fall, 1970), p. 350

[340] Val Victor Steigelmann, *Patterns of Racial Identity Imagery in Inner-City Male Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1971), p. 83.

[341] Judith D.R. Porter, *Black Child, White Child. The Development of Racial Attitudes* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 113.

[342] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[343] *Ibid.*, p. 175.

[344] *Ibid.*, 131.

[345] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[346] Alvis V.R. Adair, *A Developmental Study of Race and Sex Role Awareness Among Black Preschool Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972), p. 158.

[347] Mary Kircher and Lita Furby, "Racial Preferences in Young Children," *Child Development*, 42(1971), p. 2078.

[348] Frank J. Sciara, "Perceptions of Negro Boys Regarding Color and Occupational Status," *Child Study Journal*, 1(Summer 1971), p. 210.

[349] Georgia Kasnetsis Rohrer, *Racial and Ethnic Identification and Preference in Young Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972), p. 46.

[350] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

[351] Philip E. Kraus, *Yesterday's Children. A Longitudinal Study of Children from Kindergarten Into the Adult Years* (New York: Wiley, 1973), p. 147.

[352] Susan Harris Ward and John Braun, "Self-Esteem and Racial Preference in Black Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 42(July 1972), p. 646.

[353] Larry A. Doke and Todd R. Risley, "Some Discriminative Properties of Race and Sex for Children from an All-Negro Neighborhood," *Child Development*, 43(1972), p. 680.

[354] Edward L. Palmer, "Color Prejudice in Children as a Function of Race, Age, and Residence Neighborhood," *American Psychological Association Proceedings*, 8(1973), p. 226.

[355] Erselle Datcher, James E. Savage, Jr., and Stephen F. Checkosky, "School Type, Grade, Sex, and Race of Experimenter as Determinants of Racial Preference and Awareness in Black and White Children," *American Psychological Association Proceedings*, 8(1973), pp. 223-224.

[356] W.Curtis Banks and William James Rompf, "Evaluative Bias and Preference in Black and White Children," *Child Development*, 44(1973), pp. 779,781.

[357] Harrell R. Rodgers, Jr., "Racial Pride and Black Children," *Integrated Education*, 11 (July-October 1973), p. 63.

[358] Joan Marie Kelley, *School Segregation-Desegregation Preferences* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971), pp. 55, 67.

[359] Stuart T. Hauser, *Black and White Identity Formation. Studies in the Psychosocial Development of Lower Socioeconomic Class Adolescent Boys* (New York: Wiley, 1971), p. 101.

[360] Margaret Beale Spencer and Frances Degen Horowitz, "Effects of Systematic Social and Token Reinforcement on the Modification of Racial and Color Concept Attitudes in Black and White Preschool Children," *Developmental Psychology*, 9(1973), p. 253.

[361] See Phyllis A. Katz, "Stimulus Predifferentiation and Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes," *Child Development*, 44(1973), pp. 232-237 and "Perception of Racial Cues in Preschool Children: A New Look," *Developmental Psychology*, 8(1973), pp. 295-299; and Katz and Carol Seavey, "Labels and Children's Perceptions of Faces," *Child Development*, 44(1973), pp. 770-775.

[362] Quoted in Alvin F. Poussaint, "Building a Strong Self-Image in the Black Child," *Ebony*, 29(August 1974), pp. 140-141.

[363] Jeanne Spurlock, "Some Consequences of Racism for Children," p. 156 in Charles V. Willie, Bernard M. Kramer, and Bertram S. Brown (eds.), *Racism and Mental Health* (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973).

[364] Charles S. Johnson, "The Education of the Negro Child," *Opportunity*, (February 1936), pp. 40-41.

[365] Edwin Jordan Bass, *An Investigation of Changes in Selected Ninth Grade Students' Concepts of Self and of Others After Interaction with Selected Materials Taught in Integrated and Segregated Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968), p. 80.

[366] Elayne Meyer Donahue, *A Study of the Preference of Negro and White Kindergarten Children for Picture Book Stories Which Feature Negro and White Story Characters* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1969), p. 49.

[367] Rodney W. Roth, *The Effects of Integral Curriculum on Negro and White Fifth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969), pp. 75-76. See, also, by Roth, "How Negro Fifth Grade Students View 'Black Pride' Concepts," *Integrated Education*, 8(May-June, 1970) 24-27, and "The Effects of 'Black Studies' on Negro Fifth Grade Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, 38(1969), pp. 435-439.

[368] Jean Bell Manning, *The Influence of a Short-Term Program to Improve the Self-Concept of Selected Negro Children* (Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970), p. 67.

[369] Merle Edward Smith, *The Effects of an Experimental Program to Improve Self-Concept, Attitudes Toward School and Achievement of Negro Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan 1970), p. 92.

[370] John Lewis McAdoo, *An Exploratory Study of Racial Attitude Change in Black Preschool Children Using Differential Treatments* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970), p. 37.

[371] Robert L. Matthews, *Black Studies, Academic Achievements and the Self-Concept of Selected Tenth Graders* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1971), p. 88.

[372] Pearl Thompson Andrews, *A Study of the Effects of "Black Studies" on the Self-Concept of Negro Kindergarten Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971), p. 71.

[373] Albert H. Yee and Marvin J. Fruth, "Do Black Studies Make a Difference in Ghetto Children's Achievement and Attitudes?" *Journal of Negro Education*, 42 (Winter 1973), p. 37.

[374] Carl A. Grant, "Black Studies Materials Do Make a Difference," *Journal of Education Research*, 66(May-June 1973), p. 403.

[375] Sheila Mayers Mezz, *Effects of a "Black Cultural Positives" Program on the Self-Concepts and Attitudes of Black Junior High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1971), p. 99.

[376] David L. Fisher, *Black Studies and the Enhancement of Self-Concept as It Relates to Achievement Level in Negro High School Students* (Doctoral Dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1972), p. 63.

[377] Wendel J. Hunigan *Is Black Beautiful? A Study of Racial Awareness Among Primary-Age Children* (Master's Thesis, Illinois State University, 1972), p. 67.

CHAPTER 8
STUDENTS AND FELLOW STUDENTS

Charlotte Forten confided to her diary on September 12, 1855 how it felt to be the only black student in the Salem, Mass., normal school. She wrote that her white classmates were friendly enough in school but changed abruptly upon meeting her outside:

> These are but trifles, certainly, to the great public wrongs which we as a people are obliged to endure. But to those who experience them, these apparent trifles are most wearing and discouraging; even to the child's mind they reveal volumes of deceit and heartlessness, and early teach a lesson of suspicion and distrust. Oh! it is hard to go through life meeting contempt with contempt, hatred with hatred, fearing, with good reason, to love and trust hardly anyone whose skin is white,–however lovable, attractive, and congenial in seeming.[1]

Reflecting in part the powerful influence of her abolitionist grandfather, father, and uncle, Miss Forten refused to despair. A brighter day was in store, she believed, a day "when the rights of every colored man shall everywhere be acknowledged and respected and he shall be treated as a *man* and a *brother*!"[2]

If Miss Forten's treatment was not typical, neither was it uncommon in northern schools before the Civil War. The token presence of black children in overwhelmingly white schools, then as well as later, facilitated if it did not invite such treatment. During the century after the Forten experience, the historical record was filled with similar examples. Deliberate efforts by school authorities to prevent social interaction of black and white children were numerous. During the 1920's, school authorities in Trenton, N.J., the State's capital, errected a high fence on a school playground in order to separate children by race. Two strands of barbed wire topped the fence.[3] In Denver, the school board voted to forbid black students from using the swimming pool along with white students.[4] During the 1930's black children in Evanston, Ill., were not permitted to participate in any school sports requiring a change of clothing since this was regarded as undesirable social intermingling with white children.[5]

Discriminatory patterns of social interaction were treated by educational researchers as normal aspects of school life. During the late 1930's, however, American social scientists grew more critical of racist theories. (See chapter 3, pp. 65-87) Several psychologists turned to examine racially discriminatory interactions with public schools. Thus began a long line of research which extends into the present. In the remainder of this chapter, research findings will be reported in two broad categories: (1) social interaction under conditions of interraciality and (2) social interaction under conditions of desegregation. These terms are used in the same sense as in the preceeding two chapters.

INTERACTION AND INTERRACIALITY

Criswell studied interracial attitudes of Negro and white elementary school children in New York City; they attended three nonsegregated schools.[6] In the earliest grades, there was little mutual withdrawal because of race; the most popular children of the majority interrelated with children of the minority. By the fifth grade, both phenomena changed. Consistently, white children showed more group self-preference. In the intermediate grades, Negro children sensed the exclusion. As Criswell points out:

> There was distinct evidence that these white and Negro children of nearly the same socioeconomic status were fundamentally less congenial with seatmates chosen from the other race. The situation is most simply viewed as one in which the whites show primary self-preference, a growing sense of racial kinship dependent on community attitudes, while Negroes develop a secondary preference dependent on the increasing withdrawal of the whites and on the Negroes' keener sensitivity to this withdrawal.[7]

The character of white friendships with Negro children varied with the color composition of the classroom. In a predominantly white classroom, white children had a larger element of choice as to whether or not to strike up a friendship with a Negro classmate; thus they could choose more spontaneously, and the result was a more intimate relationship. In predominantly Negro classrooms, however, the choice narrowed and the resulting relationships were less spontaneous and intimate.

The Williams-Ryan 1954 study reported of the few Negro students in desegregated schools: "...They tended to keep themselves apart unless sought out for the more informal activities connected with school or for social occasions ...What evidence there is points to an impersonal friendliness in school and school-related activities along with some withdrawal to like groups after school."[8] Researchers for the American Political Science Association interviewed five Negro students in each of 23 predominantly white colleges.[9] Respondents reported that they attended all school events as well as informal and social affairs. "As to more subtle matters, the Negro students interviewed in most instances believed that they were not accepted on their individual merit either by the administration or the general student body ...The Negro student at a predominantly white college continues to feel that he is thought of as different, or as an outsider."

Lombardi measured the attitudes of white 9th and 10th graders toward Negroes before, and 7 months after desegregation. No change in attitudes resulted; classroom contact with Negroes seemed without consequence. He did find that white prejudice against Negroes increased as white scholastic averages fell.[10] In a study in the Washington, D.C. area, Dunn found "high authoritarian tendencies are prone to be accompanied by unfavorable attitudes toward integrated [desegregated] schools and vice versa."[11] Somewhat contrarily, Claye observed that white student attitudes toward Negroes were not related to self-concept.[12] Dwyer reported that informal associations thrived among younger children and increased with time.[13] In a southern California school, Taba observed that Negroes and Spanish-speaking students participated very little, while ability grouping added to the social distance separating Negroes from whites.[14]

Webster studied the effects of interracial contacts upon interracial attitudes.[15] He selected a sample of 60 white students and 45 Negro students in a Richmond, Calif., junior high school. Parents of two groups of children varied widely in terms of occupations and educational attainment. Control groups of children were chosen in schools where no interracial contact was possible; the Negro parents came predominantly from the South. After 6 months of contact, the Negro students were accepting whites socially more than whites were accepting Negroes; Webster had predicted this. On the other hand, he also found that white students who had experienced interracial contact had become, after 6 months, less likely to accept Negroes socially than were the white control students who had not experienced any interracial contact. How could this anomalous finding be explained?

Webster noted that he had been unable to pretest the white control students. There is thus some question whether a strict comparison could be made between white control and experimental group changes over the 6 month period. Webster noted four specific factors in the local scene that were unfavorable to friendly interracial contacts: (1) physical aggression had marked the beginning of desegregation; (2) Negroes resented the obvious avoidance behavior of white classmates; (3) white students held stereotyped conceptions about Negroes; and (4) parental support was expressed for ongoing tendencies and did not encourage friendship. Webster concluded that: (1) contact of itself is insufficient without adult guidance; (2) the initial conflict between Negro and white had not been overcome and was allowed to stand in the way of improvement; (3) without a broad community program of positive acceptance, interracial classroom behavior cannot be changed in fundamental ways; and (4) 6 months may be too short a time in which to develop constructive interracial attitudes.

Commenting upon Webster's study, Haggstrom interprets the weight of relevant research as indicating that "Negro children benefit in a number of ways from direct comparison and competition with white children regardless of the attitudes of children toward them. . ."[16]

Thomas, the principal of a Chicago upper middle class private school, discussed the procedures whereby a small number of Negro children were incorporated within the routines of the school. Negro children were encouraged by the presence of some Negro teachers. Racial intermarriage is a widespread concern among white parents and the school takes special pains to make this point to students. In 1947, when the decision to desegregate was made, a school discussion of intermarriage "brought general agreement that at an early age boys and girls would realize that they go to school with many people whom they value as friends and associates but whom they had best not consider as potential mates."[17] Thomas reported further: "For some time Negroes have testified that going to the school with a white majority has taught them to face reality. For instance, they realize the mixed dating is not widely accepted."[18]

Lee studied race relations in a Connecticut town of 10,000 people, located 10 miles from a city of 125,000.[19] "The school system is the freest area of behavior for Negroes," states Lee.[20] Inside the high school, there are many interracial best-friend relationships. For most of the town's Negro youths who live in a concentrated area, the interior of a white house is unknown; very few white youths ever visit a Negro fellow student. With regard, however, to Negroes and whites who live near one another, "they see much more of each other [and] visit more often and intimately. . ."[21]

Berlin, a psychiatrist who had served as a consultant to the San Francisco school system, explained the occurrence of discipline problems among Negro youths who were placed in heretofore all-white schools: "They want very much to become accepted in the new setting and yet they feel so hopelessly behind the other youngsters that they begin, almost inevitably, to resort to the only behavior they have learned to use to cope with such distressing feelings."[22] This aspect of desegregation was presented as though it were typical. The only other statement of a similar view is by Vredevoe.[23] His statements, however, cannot be checked; the specific instances are not identified nor is the source of any fact given.

Herriott and St. John gave a more balanced report and probably a more broadly based view when they reported a significant but not overwhelming discipline problem in schools in which populations are from lower socioeconomic levels.[24]

In the Clark-Plotkin study of Negro college students, discussed in the preceding chapter, students did report considerable integration in classroom and extra curricular activities. Nevertheless, the researchers note an "undercurrent theme of racial discrimination."[25]

St. John studied interracial association in a de facto segregated New England high school.[26] She found, contrary to expectations, that Negroes were not less active than whites, that Negroes held more offices than did whites, and that there was no relationship between a Negro student's attendance at a segregated elementary school and his interracial contacts in high school. On the other hand, a strong negative relationship was found between the extent of interracial associations of Negro high school students and the average percent of Negro children who had attended their elementary school. White children more often chose northern Negro children as friends than children who had grown up in the South. Also, white students were found readier than Negroes to initiate a personal friendship. The desegregated situation studied by St. John had existed for 18 months.

Jonsson's study of Berkeley discovered that the busing program had strongly stimulated social integration. Mothers of bused children and of children in the receiving schools reported a significantly greater number of interracial friendships than did mothers of other children.[27] Teachers verified these trends which eventuated despite considerable apprehension by the children: ". . . 24 of the 30 bused children interviewed stated. . .that the receiving school children were 'friendlier' than expected."[28] In two respects, the impact of busing was restrained: The bused Negro children were of a higher social status than the remainder of the children in the sending schools and thus did not constitute a socially upsetting factor; and the bused and receiving school children, although friendly in school, did not see much of each other on weekends or during vacations.

The Teele-Jackson-Mayo study of busing in Boston stated: "with regard to white friends, the [Negro] mothers report that 76 percent, 18 percent, and six percent of their children, respectively, have more, the same, and fewer white friends this year."[29]

Gordon studied the educational consequences of joining students of widely varying social circumstances.[30] In September, 1961, the virtually all-Negro Carver, Mich., school district was merged by State direction into the adjacent Oak Park district, an upper-middle class white suburb of Detroit. The percentage distribution of father's occupation of the merged student body was as follows:[31]

	Negro (percent)	White (percent)
Professional or Proprietor	3	46
Skilled	26	49
Unskilled	66	3
No response	5	2

(On the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, Oak Park fourth graders were at the 94th percentile; Carver students, at the 9th).

Gordon found that Negro students participated less than whites in extracurricular activities and held office less frequently. Athletic activities were the great exceptions; Negroes, in fact, joined nonacademic school clubs at a ratio of about 8 to 1, while whites joined at about 1 to 1.[32] As for Negro-white social contacts, many more hostile incidents arose between Negro and white girls than between boys. Apparently, one of the basic reasons for these tensions was economic and psychological. Lipton found, in an integrated school in Hartsdale, N.Y., that white girls were able to afford more expensive and contemporary clothing and this aroused resentment.[33]

Contrary to his expectations, Gordon found that Negro students did not tend significantly to defer to whites in selecting companions and leaders; a good deal of self-selection occurred. Yet, that was a certain amount of white snobbery.

> . . .Sixteen percent of the Negro students indicated that the fellow student they would most like to know falls into the white student category, while among white students only 1 percent indicated a desire to know most a fellow student who is in the Negro student category.[34]

Gordon had predicted significantly more interaction between Negro and Jewish students. This was true only in part; interracial social relations were marginal with all religious groups. There was also much more interracial social contact among boys than among girls.

Gordon found, as predicted, that white students would adapt to "those student activities in which Negroes engage and which tend to enhance the self-perception and status of white students."[35] More white students went out for varsity athletics after Negro students came to Oak Park. The formation of a Human Relations Club in 1964-65 was another example of adaptive behavior by white students. Another and unintended adaptation came in a cooperative training program instituted in 1963-64 as a work-study device especially for Negro seniors. When Gordon made his study, he found that whites in the program out numbered Negroes.

The academic achievement levels of white students remained high; a great number planned to attend college. Negro achievement remained low. Still, some signs indicated a change. In 1962, no Negro graduates entered college; in 1964, 6 percent did. At Northern High School, a Negro ghetto school in Detroit which a number of Carver children had attended before coming to Oak Park, only 27 percent of the students planned to enter college at some time; nearly half the Negro students at Oak Park planned to attend college.[36]

The expressed self-confidence scores of Negro students dropped. In 1961, 96 fourth through eighth graders at Carver Elementary were asked whether they were confident of being able to succeed at Oak Park; 95 percent replied yes. In 1965, Negro students at Oak Park High were asked the same question and 72 percent replied yes. Two observations should be made. First, as Gordon stresses, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children actually at Oak Park were still confident of succeeding; this is perhaps a more significant figure than the earlier 95 percent. Second, in view of the objective achievement and social status gulf between the two groups of children, a modest drop from 95 to 72 percent might reflect a necessary and realistic adjustment by the Negro children. Gordon concludes that "lower class Negro students from Carver performed more adequately than is generally true of lower class Negro students. The high achieving student culture of Oak Park was clearly a factor in this change."[37]

Throughout his study, Gordon applied an anthropological concept of acculturation as an explanatory framework. A major advantage of this approach is the view of the desegregation milieu from the interaction of white and Negro rather than simply the effect of an autonomous "situation" on Negro children. Statistical demonstration is not so important in such a study.

Racial attitudes of kindergartners were the subject of Handler's study.[38] She set up an experimental interracial group of 33 children and a control group of 26 in a suburban area. Deliberate instruction was aimed at reducing prejudice. Thus, Handler's project went beyond desegregation. Her goal had been to help the children "define persons less in terms of racial features than they had previously done." Both white and Negro children achieved this goal in some measure; children in the control group, however, actually retrogressed. "The white children still equated 'skin color' with cleanliness after all intervening experiences... [while] the Negro children as a total group related cleanliness to bathing and not skin."[39]

It is often predicted that peer relations will be impaired when children of different races are also of differing intelligence levels. Kaplan and Matkom studied this matter in a desegregated northern school.[40] Subjects were 284 white and 88 Negro children drawn from grades two through eight. While the white children were predominantly lower middle class, the Negro children lived in very poor circumstances in a segregated area.

Kaplan and Matkom administered sociometric tests to the children. They found that "when Negro and white children of similar sociometric status are compared, the white children tend to have higher intelligence on reading test scores."[41] The researchers suggest that the Negro children's sociometric success, so to speak, demonstrates that "the IQ or reading score is not an adequate reflection of the ability of Negro children and that these children may be perceived by others as brighter, and as having more of the valued intellectual and social skills than tests scores or classroom achievement shows."[42] A check was made to ensure that the high sociometric choices were not simply the result of Negroes voting for Negroes; this was found not to be the case. All in all, conclude Kaplan and Matkom hopefully: "The classroom atmosphere is not a simple reflection of the white-Negro feeling in the respective communities."[43]

Pugh conducted one of the earliest studies of Negro students in integrated and segregated schools located in Columbus and Dayton, Ohio. Among his findings were the following:

1. In mixed schools, the students were better adjusted in their home and family relationships than those in separate schools.
2. Negro students in separate schools are apparently less satisfied with their Negro administrators than are the Negro students in mixed schools with their white administrators and teachers.
3. The group in separate schools showed far better adjustment to the social life of their schools than the Negro groups in mixed schools.
4. There is no significant difference in the degree of race pride of the mixed and the separate school groups.[44]

In findings 1 and 2, the Negro students in the integrated schools had an advantage: in findings 3 the advantage lay with the segregated students. In findings 4, neither side had an advantage. It would seem warranted to conclude that integration was, on the whole, more beneficial. In a more recent study, however, Williams and Cole erroneously represent Pugh's study as indicating "that Negro morale is higher in segregated settings than in an integrated milieu."[45]

Beecher studied relations among students in two Manhattan junior high schools. On a social distance scale, Puerto Rican children were very highly accepting of Negro students; the latter, in turn, were also–but somewhat less–accepting of the Puerto Ricans.[46] Negro children were considerably more accepting of Italians than of Jews. Skin color was found not to correlate with social acceptance scores between Puerto Rican and Negro; the former tended toward acceptance of light skin, the latter, toward dark skin.[47]

Do Negro children tend to conform to the pressures of white influence when in an interracial learning situation? Janney and associates studied 80 Negro and white children in the Wichita, Kans., schools. Unexpectedly, they found that Negroes did not conform any more than whites.[48] The researchers explained the outcome as resulting from the integrated nature of the group; most earlier studies had occurred in a segregated context. Mock studied conformity among 280 Negro and white fourth, fifth and sixth graders in the Berkeley schools in 1965, when these were still largely segregated. Negro children were high conformers, Mock reported:

> The more whites there were in the group, the more the Negroes conformed. The more Negroes in the group, the less the whites conformed.[49]

High credence was given to information derived from the group with greater prestige. "As the balance of relative power and self-esteem between the races alters," Mock comments, "experimental results of quite a different sort could easily be obtained."[50]

In Daytona Beach, Fla., Schneider studied conforming behavior in 192 Negro and white seventh and eighth graders. Subjects were given several experimental tasks to perform under four grouping arrangements. No significant difference in conformance was found between Negro and white groups.[51] White subjects conformed more in the face of unanimous opposition of whites than if the unanimous opposition was voiced by blacks. Negro subjects were not subject to a similar ethnic effect. A good deal of interracial antagonism existed within the school; on social distance tests, Negro children were considerably more accepting than white children. Schneider observed: "...An ominous outlook was reflected in the behavior of the white children. The so called white racism of America was evident in the white children's hostile attitudes toward Negroes and in their disrespect for their Negro peers as sources of influence."[52] Yet, "the Negro children did not buckle under the influence of their white peers."[53] This finding contradicted the findings by I. Katz–discussed on page 58, as applied to college students. One difference between the two studies is that black and white were face to face in the Katz experiment while this was not quite the case in the Schneider study. Schneider also did not find that Negro children became more anxious after experiencing opposition of white peers.[54]

A related investigation was conducted by O'Connor in two desegregated schools in Gainesville, Fla. He studied the degree to which Negro and white children, 7 years old and in first grade, would imitate adult and peer models in two experimental tasks. Negro children, he found, did not imitate white peer models more than they imitated Negro peer models. Rather, they imitated Negro peer models more than white children imitated white peer models.[55] Thus, once more conformity was found not to be especially salient among Negro children.

Radke and associates studied social relations among Negro and white children in six Pittsburgh schools; the study was published in 1949. Radke speaks of "the overwhelming rejection of Negro by the white children..."[56] In a single integrated Pittsburgh school, "the choices of friends are made entirely within own racial group by 75 percent of the white children and 21 percent of the Negro children...Never in the community and only rarely outside the classroom...do the white children choose Negro children as friends."[57]

Hildebrandt studied 798 Negro and white students in seven schools in Dayton, Ohio; the percentage of Negroes ranged from zero in one school to 100 in another. The major finding was that Negroes strongly favored integrated schools while whites rejected them.[58] In this cross-sectional study, it appeared that the older the Negro child, the more strongly he favored integration; the older the white student, the more he rejected integrated schools.[59]

The all-Negro school registered the smallest majority support for integration. Both groups of students were asked to gauge the integration sentiments of the groups.

> A large majority of whites conceive of their fellows as preferring an all-white school, while a small majority of Negroes believe that white children prefer a mixed school... A large majority of whites believe Negroes prefer separate schools while a large majority of Negroes believe that their own group prefers the opposite.[60]

In Oak Ridge, Tenn., 5 months of desegregation yielded significantly less antagonistic attitudes toward Negroes on the part of white high school students. Curiously, this finding held true even for white students still attending a segregated high school.[61]

Koslin and associates studied the effect of integration on interpersonal racial attitudes of 129 Negro and white first and second graders in three schools. One was all-Negro, another all-white, and a third equally divided. A test was constructed in which children pasted decals of different racial figures and drew a school. The major findings were as follows:

> Integrated Negro subjects were significantly closer to white children target figures than were segregated Negroes... Integration accelerated a tendency for white subjects to more closer to Negro target figures as grade increased. Regardless of race, integrated subjects were closer to school than segregated subjects.[62]

A second study by Koslin and associates of first and third grade children in four schools in a large eastern city arrived at somewhat different findings. In the year between the two grades, white children continued to prefer all-white surroundings while

Negro children changed from a slight preference for whites to a clear preference for Negro teachers and peers.[63] In a third study, involving five schools, all of which enrolled from 25 to 75 percent Negroes, children tended to prefer peers of their own race. In racially balanced classrooms – where enrollment reflected the racial composition of total enrollment in the school – three tests "revealed positive relationships between school racial balance and the favorableness of interracial attitudes, with any possible effects of socioeconomic status controlled."[64]

McDowell studied the willingness of 582 Negro youths, aged 16 to 19, in the District of Columbia to associate with whites. As a whole, they expressed a very high readiness to do so.[65] The 80 percent who were attending schools were more willing than were the 20 percent who had dropped out of school. McDowell found: "The degree of voluntary, informal associations that Negro youths have had with their white fellow students is the one variable that we have examined whose influence on willingness to associate is both strong, unambiguous, and statistically reliable. This is true with regard to social contacts in school but even more so with regard to social contacts out of school."[66] To the researcher, informality of social contact signalled interaction on a more human level. "Without these voluntary, informal dealings," noted McDowell, "in-school contacts are a ritual, a temporary fiction in which both Negro and white participants concur until they depart the confines of the school building for the 'real life' outside."[67]

Fewer than a third of the boys had attended a predominantly white school or one with equal numbers of whites and blacks. Even fewer had experienced informal social contacts with white boys. These Negro students seemed especially prepared for more extensive contacts in other areas of social life.[68]

What criterion did Negro boys employ in selecting whites with whom they sought to socialize? "By far the most frequent criterion in judging whites," according to McDowell, "is how those whites judge Negroes."[69] She explained that in any stratification system a social subordinate generally pays "close attention to the clues of his superior."[70] In the studies of conforming behavior that were reviewed earlier in this chapter, the factor of superordination vs subordination was critical. Inequality of status, McDowell notes, precludes, strictly speaking, emergence of Negro *prejudice*. The Negro is ordinarily not in a position to enforce his ethnic antipathies nor is he accustomed to initiate exlusion. McDowell stresses that "interacial contact is not rejected per se [by Negroes] but when it involves a greater risk of nonacceptance by whites."[71]

One is reminded of Morland's point that social interaction between Negro and white in racist America will become more humanizing when notions of racial superordination and subordination disappear.

McDowell's research is significant for its sensitivity to the quality of social interaction and for its awareness of status factors in interracial relations.

Of methodological interest is research by Briggs in Alabama. She studied the degree of success Negro students experienced in high school in developing a written language closer to standard English. Between 9th and 11th grades in writing, the boys overall decreased in spelling, vocabulary, verb, and syntactic errors.[72] Girls made more errors at the end of the 2-year period. This study was done in all-Negro schools. If the locus had been a desegregated school, it is likely that changes in the boys' writing would have been attributed to their greater propensity to interact with their white peers and thus to unlearn "Negro dialect." This underscores the need to attempt control of as many variables as possible.

Boys in Project A Better Chance (ABC) experienced a very sharp contrast in sociocultural styles. (It will be recalled that project involved the enrollment of minority youngsters from large cities in private, high-tuition preparatory schools.) As Wessman points out: "While it would be unfair to characterize the independent schools as citadels of snobbery, it would be unrealistic not to recognize that social status plays a significant role in the recruitment of their clientele."[73] Nevertheless, about three-quarters of the boys made a clearly satisfactory social adjustment. A degree of racial conflict occurred: "Over half. . . felt that they had encountered some degress of prejudice in the school, and . . .a third. . .felt the incidents were serious and upsetting."[74] The program was largely successful over the 2 years, but there developed among many participants as "increased level of tension, worry, and drivenness."[75] But, adds Wessman, "one cannot aspire without facing the threat of frustration of aspiration."[76]

Hall and Gantry reviewed the social interaction of 377 Negro high school students in desegregated schools. In general boys interacted much more with their white peers than did girls with theirs. Participation in extracurricular activities was reported by 58.3 percent of the students in their first year, 71 percent the second year, and 100 percent in the fourth year.[77] Interracial activities that involved formal rather than informal interaction were most readily engaged in – club meetings rather than dances.

In its racial isolation study, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found that students of both races who attend desegregated schools do not automatically modify their attitudes toward one another. As the Commission states:

> . . .School desegregation has its greatest impact upon student attitudes and preferences through the mediating influence of friendship with students of the other race. Negro and white students who attend school with each other, but have no friends of the other race, are less likely to prefer desegregated situations than students in desegregated schools who have such friends. Having attended schools with students of the other race and having friends of the other race contributes to preferences for desegregation. The effect is strongest for students who have had both experiences.[78]

Attendance at desegregated schools remains an influence in a person's life long after he has left school.

A separate study was made of the relationship of interracial tensions in the school to Negro achievement and attitudes. The findings showed that Negro achievement was higher where tensions were least. McPartland and York observe: "Negro student achievement and attitudes in desegregated classes are related to the degree of interracial tension within the school"[79] (They neglect, however, to observe that more or less the same is true in segregated classes.[80]) McPartland and York also found that interracial tension varied with the number of children who had previously experienced desegragated schooling. Interracial friendships were more frequent among Negro students active in extracurricular events.

The researchers conclude:

> . . .There is indeed an effect of desegregated schooling which results from the racial composition of the classroom, apart from the exchanges in social class level of the fellow students which often accompanies desegregation. The differences seem to be well explained by the racial associations of the student, which are much more a function of the racial composition of the classroom than either the student's social class or the social class level of the schools.[81]

In a somewhat related study, Caffrey and Jones found no significant social class differences among the racial attitudes of southern white high school seniors. The study does not report how many attended desegregated schools.[82]

Interraction in the Hardy Junior High School of Chattanooga, Tenn., was studied by Smith. While the school had been desegregated in 1965, he found 5 years later that "on every major dimension of social interaction studied, it is an internally segregated and not integrated school."[83] Seating in the classroom or cafeteria reflected segregative patterns as did the playground. No indication is given in the study of any efforts by faculty or staff to effect changes in the patterns. Martinez-Monfort examined racial attitudes of students attending seven high schools in the vicinity of Baton Rouge La. As measured by a polygraph ("lie detector") and other means, no relation was found between racial attitudes and previous attendance in a desegregated school.[84]

Harrison and associates studied racial factors and interaction among preschool children. On an experimental task performed in two-person and four-person groups, some racial differences emerged. In four-person groups, black children were more inhibited than were the white children. In two-person groups, however, there was greater readiness to initiate and respond to social contacts. The possible classroom significance of this study is lessened by two facts: (1) all the children were strangers to one another, and (2) the entire contact lasted only 10 minutes. In a number of situations studied by others, black children were almost always more outgoing than in this study.[85]

In 1972, Krenkel studied interaction among 675 fourth, fifth, and sixth graders, apparently in a San Francisco school. Of some interest was her employment of photography as documentation of interaction patterns. On a preliminary test, no significant differences in self-contact were found for Asian, black, and Anglo children. While a great deal of sex segregation was recorded in the photography, relatively little ethnic segregation showed up in play and eating situations. A study of the latter photographs yielded the following percentage distribution.[86]

Integrated situations:

Asian-black-Anglo	38 percent

Partly integrated situations:	
Anglo-black	3 percent
Anglo-Asian	32 percent
Anglo-black	12 percent
	39 percent
Segregrated situation:	
Anglo	0 percent
Black	4 percent
Asian	10 percent
	14 percent

In other words 39 percent of the photographs showed Asian-Black-Anglo children interacting; and so on. A moderate degree of segregation with respect to black children was evident. Krenkel also collected data on friendship, leadership, and work group preferences of the children. These indicated the absence of segregation.

The racial attitudes of black and white seniors in three suburban high schools were compared with the racial composition of the schools. One school was all-white; one, technically desegregated; and a third, integrated. Lachat found that at the latter school, teachers were more devoted to the educational mission of the school; while academic differences between black and white existed, they were not so extreme as they were at the desegregated school. While white students at the integrated school were distinctly more favorable to black, little social interaction occurred. Unfortunately, the researcher did not have an opportunity to enter classrooms and observe students and teachers at work.[87]

Kaalberg made an especially imaginative study of interaction. She wondered how interracial attitudes squared with interracial practices. To test this, she showed children photographs of own-race and opposite-race children and elicited statements of preference. Then, the test subjects met the children who had posed for the photographs. In general, racial factors were more important in the actual situation than in the photograph phase.[88] Kaalberg tested 66 second, fourth, and sixth grade girls in several parochial schools in Mississippi.

In 1973, Mead, a white man, attended the 25th reunion of his graduation class at Evanston (Ill.) Township High School. He was shocked to find that few black alumni wanted to attend. In searching out the reasons, he first came to understand how blacks had fared at ETHS a quarter-century earlier. Roy King, one-time black student leader, wrote Mead: "To be a reunion, there must have had to have been a union." "It was *all* bad," recalled another alumnus. "All black kids had a bad time at Evanston High School." King recalled: "I don't feel that there was hostility. . . There was indifference, which is worse. We were nonexistent. You can almost fight hostility, but indifference–it's the worst thing in the world. . . We kind of melted into the walls. . .and this is how we would feel at this reunion."[95]

In 1965, Coons reported the findings of a sample of 120 white and black students upon completing ETHS. The 60 white students had taken 238 honor courses while the 60 black students had taken only one. Coons describes this as a "ghastly statistic."[91] Some 8 years later, the academic relationship of black and white in the school was as disastrous as ever. On the SCAT, a measure of academic aptitude, white sophomores averaged the 88th percentile while black sophomores registered only at the 8th.[92]

During 1970-71, Patchen and Davidson conducted what is thus far the most comprehensive and systematic study of racial interaction in the secondary schools of a single large city, in this case Indianapolis, Ind.[93] First results were published in 1973. The inquiry concerned 12 settings – there were 11 schools but one had two campuses. Enrollments ranged from 98.9 percent white to 99.8 percent black. Student responses to a questionnaire were 82 percent for blacks and about 85 percent for whites.

In most of the schools, Patchen and Davidson found, interracial interaction had a positive effect on black and white students. Black students in every school reported a more favorable opinion of white people since attending high school. On 8 out of 11 school sites, white students reported more favorable attitudes toward blacks. A majority of both groups of students had had some kind of friendly contact during the semester of interviewing. Students were asked about the occurrence of unfriendly actions. Just over two-fifths of the black students reported they had not experienced such actions; slightly under one-fifth of the whites said they had. With reference to threats of harm, whites reported them more frequently than blacks. Nearly three-fifths of all whites reported blacks had tried to extort money from them but fewer than one-fifth actually gave money.

The researchers also examined the issue of physical aggression. A summary of their findings is presented in the table on p. 10. During 1970-71, Evidence concerning intra- and interracial fights during 1970-71 year by high school in Indianapolis[1]

School site	Percent non-white	Number of fights reported in 1970-71	Number of fights		Proportion of intraracial fights involving blacks only (percent)	Interracial fights as percent of total fights	Inte in 19 pare ad
			Intraracial	Interracial			
1	1.1	0	0	0			
2	8.7	1	1	0	100	0	No
3	13.6	4	3	1	67	25	
4	13.9	2	2	0	50	0	
5	26.6	12	9	3	67	25	
6	35.5	5	4	1	75	20	
7	36.9	7	3	4	34	57	
8	36.9	16	14	2	64	12	
9	53.0	51	43	8	70	15	
10	53.3	1	0	1	–	100	Not
11	71.2	4	3	1	100	25	
12	99.8	4	4	0	100	0	
		107	86	21	74 (ave.)	20 (ave.)	

---

[1] Martin Patchen and James D. Davidson with Gerhard Hofmann and William R. Brown, *Patterns and Determinants of Inter-Racial Interaction in Indianapolis Public High Schools* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, July, 1973), pp. 16, 5

Evidence concerning intra- and interracial fights during 1970-71 year by high school in Indianapolis[1]

Number of fights reported in 1970-71	Number of fights		Proportion of intraracial fights involving blacks only (percent)	Interracial fights as percent of total fights	Interracial fighting in 1970-71 as compared to 1969-70 administrative judgment
	Intraracial	Interracial			
0	0	0			Same
1	1	0	100	0	Not available
4	3	1	67	25	Less
2	2	0	50	0	Less
12	9	3	67	25	Less
5	4	1	75	20	Less
7	3	4	34	57	Same
16	14	2	64	12	Less
51	43	8	70	15	Less
1	0	1	–	100	Not applicable
4	3	1	100	25	Less
4	4	0	100	0	Less
107	86	21	74 (ave.)	20 (ave.)	

Davidson with Gerhard Hofmann and William R. Brown, *Patterns and Determinants of Inter-Racial Interaction in the* *ols* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, July, 1973), pp. 16, 57.

107 fights were reported to central school authorities. Of the fights, 86 or 80 percent, involved students of one race. The other 21 or 20 percent, were interracial. Of the 86 intraracial fights, 64 involved blacks only. The 11 school sites where fights were reported can be divided into predominantly white (numbers 2-8) and predominantly black (numbers 9-12). In the first group, occurred 44 percent of all fights and 52 percent of all interracial fights. Nearly two-thirds of all the intraracial fights in this group of involved blacks only. In the second group of schools occurred 56 percent of all reported fights and 48 percent of all interracial fights. More than 80 percent of the intraracial fights in the second group involved blacks only. Total enrollment in the first group was 15,229; in the second group, 8,350. The rate per 1,000 students of reported fights varied as follows: entire group–5; first group–3; second group–7.

This compilation yields several findings which are contrary to the reports of the mass media. The frequency of open violence in the high schools – of Indianapolis, at least – is far less than implied by press reports. One school alone – number 9 – accounted for nearly half of all fights and more than a third of all interracial fights. The level of student violence was sharply lower in predominantly white – or less segregated – schools. Most student fighting occurred within, rather than between, racial groups.

These violence data are compatible with the general findings of Patchen and Davidson. The generally positive interracial attitudes of the students are reflected in very low rates of interracial violence. In their further analysis, the researchers probe into numerous forces playing a role in racial interaction. Black teachers, for example, were perceived by black students as favoring friendly contacts between black and white students. Teacher attitudes were found to be an important influence on students in such matters. Patchen and Davidson also stress the need to view race relations in the school within a broader community framework. Yet, as students moved through high school, their interracial attitudes grew more positive. This suggests that school influences exert an independent influence on students even when desegregation is initiated under temporarily difficult circumstances.

The researchers drew practical implications from their findings. They recommended an increase in black faculty in view of their apparently beneficent effect on interracial relations. Special measures to encourage black girls were suggested in view of findings – supported by numerous other studies – that girls have the more difficult time establishing productive roles in nonsegregated schools. Tokenism of numbers works against viable integration, hold Patchen and Davidson.

> School officials and concerned citizens should strive for a level of racial integration at each school which allows students and teachers of both races to feel that they are an integral part of the school and that their presence and interest are reflected in the school's academic and extra-curricular activities.[94]

Since increased opportunity for interracial contact usually led to more contacts without any significant increase in unfriendly contacts, the researchers underscored the desirability of more racially heterogeneous classes and random assignment of seating.

Patchen and Davidson found student racial attitudes, both positive and negative, to depend heavily on group context. They recommended therefore that efforts to change negative racial attitudes might better take the shape of "carefully moderated group discussion rather than lecturing or providing information to individuals."[95] Differences in socioeconomic status between black and white students, a topic beloved by educational researchers, were found to be a fairly secondary source of problems between the groups. Considerably more important were differences between the groups related to educational goals and school behavior. "While it is not easy to reduce such differences," acknowledged Patchen and Davidson, "they are obviously more amenable to school actions than are differences in socioeconomic status."[96]

The foregoing account is necessarily compressed. Numerous qualifying conditions and negative experiences have been omitted in the interest of reporting main trends. It happens these trends are favorable to racial interaction. Patchen and Davidson's analysis shows that one must go well beyond racial percentages and a few other numbers in order to comprehend the totality of interracial interaction.[97] Their valuable research is made all the more useful by dealing in depth with a single school system.

DISCIPLINE, DISORDER, AND DISRUPTION

School people and researchers used to discuss "discipline." Now they talk about "disorder" or "disruption." The shift is significant. Breaches of discipline are ordinarily viewed as personal and individual. Disorder or disruption on the other hand, is collective and regarded as a challenge to constituted authority. The disorderly reject the entire traditional scheme of things while the undisciplined object to this or that aspect of the school routine. When race is added to disorder, the resulting mixture becomes the concern of newspaper editors and of occasional researchers and writers.

Most discussions of school disorder stress the role of physical violence. Often, however, when the students in these schools are interviewed or when they write their own account of school experiences, violence as such plays a subsidiary role. Instead, they emphasize educational shortcomings of the school. Newton, who later became a cofounder of the Black Panthers, recalls his junior high and senior high school days in Oakland, Calif. "My high school diploma was a farce," he wrote. "When my friends and I graduated [in 1959], we were ill-equipped to function in society, except at the bottom, even though the system said we were educated."[98] During these years, he continues, "I did not have one teacher who taught me anything relevant to my own life or experience. . ."[99] Deeply ingrained in the narrative is a conviction that educational sufficiency was the core consideration. By implication, Newton contended that even in the complete absence of disorder the traditional scheme in the schools was consistent with failing educational functioning. In this sense, disorder is derivative–not primary.

Three national studies of student disorder were made in 1969-70. The first, by the Community Relations Service (CRS) of the U.S. Department of Justice, covered 140 secondary schools located in 52 cities and 17 States. The schools enrolled a total of 165,737 students. Three basic issues were singled out by CRS: (1) institutional racism, (2) institutional irrelevancy and (3) communication failure between administrators and protestors. About half the schools in the sample had adopted an ethnic studies program in response to student demands. The survey found that "by a ratio of two to one, teachers were hostile toward protesting students."[100]

The other studies were made by Havighurst and by Bailey.[101] Havighurst's study covered about 700 high schools in 45 large cities. Bailey's study also included a large sample. Both studies agreed that (1) the greatest disorders occurred at schools that recently became desegregated and (2) at nearly all these schools the authorities had not prepared staff, student body, and community for the impending changes.[102] According to the Havighurst study, "the most striking aspect of the large city high school is conflict among students and between students and faculty."[103] Inappropriate education was scored as an important contributing factor to student unrest.[104]

Worcester and Asbaugh studied student unrest in 34 high schools located in the six largest urban school districts of Texas. The most disruptive was the school attended by middle class students; the least disruptive was the predominantly Mexican American school. Integrated schools, they found, were no more disruptive than predominantly black schools, thus, according to the researchers, "challenging the notion that integration produces widespread student disruption."[105] Houmes studied "racial disruption" in the high schools of two large school districts in Florida. The period covered was January 1, 1971 – March 1, 1972. Houmes sought to discover whether the disruption was affected by presumably different educational expectations held by black and white students. He found no evidence to support "the prevailing notion among other writers that black and white students desire and need considerably different educational programs."[106]

Race-related violence in three Pittsburgh high schools during 1967-1970 was analyzed by Lockhart. Only acts of violence that resulted in complaints being filed with city police were considered. During these years, 84 such acts were reported. Black students were arrested in disproportionately large numbers while whites were rarely charged with having initiated violence. Late in 1967, black students at Perry, Allegheny, and Oliver high schools demonstrated. At Oliver, the issue was the failure of school authorities to discover and punish white students who had harassed a group of black students. Violence erupted and a week-long boycott followed. At the three schools, black students and parents set forth a set of demands that advocated (1) excluding outsiders from schools, (2) strict enforcement of class attendance rules, (3) stricter codes of discipline, and (4) retention of police in school "until internal control and discipline were established." A course in black history was requested. Authorities granted these and several other demands but refused to remove an unpopular principal.

While the presence of police was congenial to students and parents, complaints quickly developed. Members of the police tactical squad were hostile to black students. Counselors at two of the schools reported to Lockhart that "when police were not clearly uniformed with identification badges showing, these officers were more prone to intimidate the black students."[107] Lockhart also studied the role of black teachers in race-related violence at the same schools. She found a fairly high correlation (.68) between the presence of black teachers and the occurrence of violence. While students initiated the events, the teachers, "largely inexperienced . . . and in their early 20's . . ." were empathic with demonstrating students. Lockhart suggests that students may have interpreted such empathy as condoning violence.

For much of the period 1967-1970, the city school authorities apparently viewed the unrest as posing a control problem. Lockhart declares that during the same years, the school board and administration "appeared to take little advantage of opportunities to make positive utilization of race-related violent incidents." During 1971-72, however, the school system began to take definite steps. Until then, effective leadership in terms of changing race relations in the school system was lacking.

Ritterband and Silberstein studied disorders that occurred in the 56 academic high schools of New York City during November 1968 and June 1969. Their analysis concerned disorders in which police were summoned and which involved five or more students. All these disorders fell into either of two categories: political and nonpolitical. The former were disorders marked by demands for systemwide change and in the structure of schools while the latter involved specific conditions at a school. During the period of study, three out of five of the academic schools experienced political disorders. (At this time, a severe struggle of black and Puerto Rican communities against the United Federation of Teachers took place in the city as a whole.) The presence of black teachers, according to the researchers, heightened the probability of political disorder. Such disorder occurred where a critical combination of politicized black teachers and students took place. This sort of disorder, then, is regarded as caused by individual action rather than by the shortcomings of the school system.[108]

Lockhart, it will be recalled, had pointed to black teachers as a secondary force in generating disorder. Ritterband and Silberstein, however, regarded then as primary. Pitts, on the other hand, disagreed strongly with Ritterband and Silberstein. Based on his detailed study of an all-black high school in Chicago, Pitts held that black students "often exert strong influence on the racial behavior of (black) teachers as well as their fellow students.[109] He also feels the coauthors erred in failing to examine the role played by systematic discrimination in producing the disorder. Pitts also criticizes the fact that Ritterband and Silberstein base their analysis on police data without any firsthand, independent study of the black teachers whose role they evaluate as crucial. Lockhart and Pitts, for their respective studies, had conducted a close, onsite analysis of teachers and other factors.[110]

A few studies of violence in single schools have been made. Caley reported on Washington Junior High School in Seattle, Wash. A predominantly black school, Washington had for years been administered under the principle of "contain and control." As Caley observes of the appointment of a principal in 1957 who had been an administrator in a State institution for delinquent boys: "A former superintendent told me it was thought at the time that the appointee's past experience could be valuable in handling 'disadvantaged' and 'black' and 'difficult' children at Washington."[111] By 1968, two successors had been appointed but the regimen of the school remained essentially repressive and, accordingly to Caley, disrespectful of the children. Early that year the ideology of black power emerged in the school. In September, the school was closed by authorities as black students demonstrated against the authoritarian regime of the school. A severe crackdown was ordered upon reopening with new disciplinary rules drawn up. Parents supported the new measures. Academic deterioration worsened. By late fall, some 90 to 100 students out of a total of 540 were absent daily. About 50 black students had been "pushed out." White and Asian students easily managed to obtain transfers. The sole evidence of change was the playing of records at lunchtime. "We let them have this," the principal told Caley who concluded that peace had been won at the cost of further educational deterioration.

A similar case was studied by Ochberg and Trickett. After free lunches and bus transportation had been discontinued by the school, black students – the ones mainly affected – petitioned for restoration of the cuts. They also requested courses in black history and more black teachers. "Many faculty members," reported the researchers, "said they were shocked that students would make demands. No official faculty or administrative response was given to the students."[112] Staff and faculty seemed at a loss to understand why an eruption of violence could have occurred.

EXPECTATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT

In a racist order, it seems "natural" to expect the privileged group to achieve more. The power of racism is attested by the fact that the less privileged group learns to regard itself as less capable. As black leader Huey Newton commented with respect to the time he was a school child in Oakland, Calif.; "We not only accepted ourselves as inferior; we accepted the inferiority as inevitable and inescapable."[113] The last chapter presented Jorgensen's view that a critical potential of desegregation is to help children unlearn the doctrine of racial superiority and inferiority. This is to be achieved by acquiring competence in the academic work of the classroom and school. As academic competence is acquired, by minority as well as majority children, the doctrine of racial superiority recedes. Minority children at once expect success of themselves and are expected by others to succeed.

But how may this be achieved? Undoubtedly, individual teachers have worked out successful mechanisms by intuition if not otherwise. The present writer. for example, taught for some years in a large urban community college, attended for the most part by white students. Many had graduated from high schools in which they had not been required to write papers and essay type examinations. They were thus exceedingly anxious when expected to do so in their college class. Most perplexing to them was the mysterious process whereby a "subjective" device like an essay could be "objectively" – i.e., fairly – graded. A pragmatic solution suggested itself to the teacher. He asked each student who received an "A" or "B" on any of five questions–students answered any two of the five–to read their answers to the class. Almost always the class saw clearly the merits which were then commented on by the teacher.

Later on the teacher moved to a community college which was predominantly black and Latino. The same examination procedure was followed. Now, however, the practice had an additional significance: inevitably since half or more of the "model" students were black, less proficient blacks *and* whites in the class had the experience of listening to competent work which was the product of black as well as white students. In a small but concrete way, this helped disestablish the notion of racial superiority and inferiority. Consequently, expectations of success may have been broadened. The most important effect sought by the teacher was a realization by black and white students that race did not necessarily confer a handicap or an advantage upon intellectual performance. There was no attempt to demonstrate that all students are equally bright. At best, this practice affected only one classroom and even then to an undetermined degree. Most probably it had a slight effect on the attitudes concerning the expectancy of success.

Another practical approach, laying heavier stress on the creation of a schoolwide structure of success-expectancy is represented by the Central School District in New York State. Every classroom in the several schools of this suburban district is ethnically balanced (two-thirds white, one-third black) and also contains bright and slower children of each race. In such a setting, students may conceivably learn that academic success or failure is not necessarily connected with race–howsoever the culture at large suggests the opposite. Ideally, this realization releases the child and the teacher for constructive work, undeterred by racist preconceptions. As Lipton, a former principal in this system, wrote: ". . .One child at a time is no longer segregation."[114] This effort to facilitate individual learning – including both academic skills and broader human relations attitudes–has apparently met with an appreciable degree of success.[115]

Researchers completely ignored – if, indeed, they ever knew of – the constructive experience in Central District 7. Only during the early 1970s did research literature on expectancy of success begin to face up to issues already confronted in practice for over a decade.

Entwisle and Webster, studying children in three schools of the Baltimore area, were especially interested in how children raised their self-expectations and the role played in these changes by adults and by various social factors. (In an earlier study of four schools, they had used successfully a device of storytelling to raise children's expectations.[116]) In the present study, second, third, and fourth graders' expectations for success were ascertained (Phase I) and then each performed and received strong encouragement from an adult (Phase II). Changes in the rate at which children raised their hands to offer an answer constituted a concrete measure of the effectiveness of the reinforcement, i.e., the encouragement by adults. The experiment was successful. Generally speaking, whenever the adult was of the same race as the children, those childrens' expectations rose; this was true both in segregated and integrated groups.

Initial assessments by the researchers revealed somewhat surprisingly that the expectations of black children were no lower than those of white children. Nor did they find evidence that racial tensions lowered black expectations. One of the three schools had been desegregated for a number of years. In this school there was no evidence of a depressive effect of race on expectations. "Our results. . . ," conclude Entwisle and Webster, "may well indicate that sustained integration of an elementary school can break down the use of race as a basis for performance expectations."[117] They suggest, as did Patchen and Davidson, that attention be paid to the quality of interracial contact experienced by students before entering the particular school under study. Entwisle and Webster, for example, guess that the high expectations of the black children can be explained in part on the ground that they "may have higher self-concepts than older children who come from segregated schools. . ."[118]

Another line of research in this area has been conducted by Cohen. Her central concern is the importation of broader social patterns of white dominance into the classroom so that both black and white children have low expectation of black success. In classroom work groups, therefore, it becomes "normal" for whites to dominate over blacks and thus further depress expectations of black performance. This phenomenon Cohen calls "interracial interaction disability."[119] The existence of the disability is regarded as virtually universal among black and white children. In the integrated classroom, according to Cohen, "the difference in social status combines with difference in academic status to lower academic task activity and academic self-concept in black and other low-status students."[120]

Cohen and her colleagues experimented in raising expectations of black performance by giving black students advanced training in a complicated task and then having these students teach white students how to perform it. This display of black proficiency was aimed at affecting self and other expectations of success. Still, in the face of black proficiency, some white students in the four-person experimental groups tended to dominate. The experimenters concluded that the specific task was only the beginning, not the culmination, of changes required to shed race of its connotation of disability. During a summer, therefore, Lohman and associates conducted a 4-week program at the Center for Interracial Cooperation; participants were black and white junior high school boys. The educational regimen at the center was radically different from that of the traditional school. An openness characterized the relation of student to teacher; evaluation was nonthreatening; and the classroom tasks were perceived as highly relevant to the students. Under these conditions, much more positive results ensued. A more genuine equality of interaction emerged.

The Lohman researchers are strongly of the mind that desegregated classrooms without features such as existed in the center will not produce expectations of equal performance. In short, a conventionally desegregated school will perpetuate the conventional disability of race in the classroom. At the same time, the educational significance of the center is ambiguous. Since the schools to which the participants are returned are conventional, the researchers feel that the more-equal expectations will be defeated by the old routines and relationships.

In fact, research into interracial interaction disability has its share of exceptions and reversals. In her original study of 19 four-person interracial groups, Cohen found that "the status ordering of all groups did not repeat the status ordering of the outer society; there were some black-dominated groups."[121]

Roper studied those black students in groups who were the "assertive," i.e., the most influential or talkative group members. She predicted that white members of groups dominated by black assertives would resent this leadership and give them a hard time; and that the black assertives, for their part, would differ from white assertives in being more emotional and demonstrative in their style. On neither count did her findings support the predictions.[122]

> White group members did not subject black assertives to a "social threat" situation and black assertives did not behave in a more "social-emotional" manner than white assertives. White members of groups in which blacks were assertive reported that they liked . . . [the black assertive] the most in their group and highly evaluated his contribution to the task. White subjects did not direct significantly more negative behavior to black than to white assertives. There were more "release of tension" behaviors and lower enjoyment reported in groups where a white was assertive than in groups where a black was assertive.[117]

Both the possibilities of an equal chance to lead and to be accepted are antithetical to the basic suppositions of interracial interaction disability.

The conclusions of Entwisle and Webster and of Cohen are at one in pointing to the need to raise performance expectations as a prerequisite for productive integration. They differ, however, on the prospects of achieving this under conventional classroom conditions, with Cohen insisting on the prior need to overhaul the structure of the school. Entwisle and Webster have suggested that one reason for this divergence in views is that Cohen's subjects attended largely segregated schools and reflected this orientation on the experimental task.[118] Entwisle and Webster, on the other hand, were able to show equal status interaction within the limits of existing schools; they pointed to student integration as a facilitating factor. One might add age of student as a modifying factor. Cohen studied junior high school students while Entwisle's subjects were considerably younger. It is also likely that both groups of children differed as to degree of acquaintanceship. Cohen's subjects were strangers to one another while many of Entwisle's were classmates.[123]

Changing student expectations of minority achievement is basic to the attainment of equal opportunity. It is perhaps the area in which schools may make their clearest repudiation of racism.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education has been virtually immune to significant racial change. As indicated in chapter 2, legal sanctions to enforce desegregation in colleges and universities are in the most preliminary stages of formulation. Consequently, the weight of historic exclusory and discriminative practices is still being felt. In higher education institutions, other than traditionally black colleges, the black presence is of a token dimension. The typical large State-financed college or university enrolls from 3 to 5 percent minority students. An outstanding exception is the City University of New York which, however, accounts for a considerable degree of internal segregation in its senior units especially. Studies of racial interaction on the campus therefore reflect the tokenistic character of enrollment. The past decade has seen little essential change in this regard.

Clark and Plotkin studied the academic record of 519 Negro students who had been helped financially through integrated colleges by the National Scholarship Service and the Fund for Negro Students. These 519 students had attended college during 1952 and 1956. Their college aptitude, as measured by SAT, was below the average of the national college population; yet, proportionally more of them completed college with at least average grades than did the general college population.[125] Clark and Plotkin stress that "the academic performance of these students is far beyond the level that would be indicated by such predictive devices as college board scores, family income, and educational background."[126]

Negro students from southern high schools earned higher college grades than did black graduates of northern high schools. Clark and Plotkin suggest four alternative explanations without supporting or rejecting any: (1) northern high schools are inferior, (2) southern students are more highly motivated, (3) some kind of intellectual selectivity among southern high school students, or (4) a combination of these factors. Whatever the reason, southern students are examples of Negroes who were able to function satisfactorily under the same intellectual standards as white youths. Educational success did not diminish their racial identification; they were a highly select group.

Bindman studied a considerably less select group. These were 154 males of the 326 Negro students on the main campus (Urbana) of the

University of Illinois.[127] Nearly half the larger total was composed of graduates of Chicago high schools. As in the case of the Clark-Plotkin sample, the University of Illinois Negro students were performing academically at a higher level than could have been predicted by precollege test scores. Unlike the Clark-Plotkin sample, however, these students were twice as likely as white students to be marginal performers.[128] Only about one-sixth of the 154 Negro students were able to earn a "C+" average and thus remain in good standing in most university curricula.[129]

Student performance at the university seemed unrelated either to socioeconomic background or to attendance at a predominantly Negro high school. Bindman discovered that Negro students from more advantaged homes were not better prepared.[130] Some 70 percent of the students fell below the 15th percentile of all students enrolled in their department. To Bindman, this indicated that "students from both 'integrated' and predominantly Negro high schools came inadequately prepared for college."[131] At no level of academic performance were the records of Negro students distinguishable from one another on the criterion of having attended segregated or presumably nonsegregated schools.[132] The dynamics of poor Negro scholastic performance were described by Bindman as essentially a social-psychological process of on campus alienation.

On the same campus, only 2 years later, Daniel studied the role of black sororities. She characterized the relationship of the black student at the University of Illinois as "marginal." Of the more than 27,000 students on campus, only 370 were black. Two sororities were available but neither had its own house so all members lived in the university residence halls. Along with members of three black fraternities, joint social events were planned. As one coed member put it: "It means we have our own society in this exile."[133] The solidarity of the sorority helped alleviate the marginality of campus life.

Daniel compared the "Greeks" with Independents, i.e., black women students who were nonmembers of sororities. While nearly 7 of 10 Greeks had chosen black roommates, fewer than one-fourth of Independents had done so. The Greeks spent about 3 percent of their days with the white students; Independents, 44. Not surprisingly, the dorms were the primary locale of racial interaction; but while nearly one-third of the Independents sometimes went out to eat with white students, no Greeks did. One factor that helped explain the difference was the earlier school experience with white students. Thus, while 69 percent of Greeks had attended a predominantly black high school, only 53 percent of the Independents had done so. An even larger disparity existed between the two sororities. The comparable figures were 81 percent and 54 percent. Here, too, the disparity in high school experience was expressed in other ways. In general, the former group found it more difficult to get along with white classmates.

Johnson and his colleagues studied the academic adequacy of Chicago high schools from which University of Illinois Negro and white students graduated. They compared grade point averages earned at the university (at the Chicago campus) with the racial composition of the high school. This finding is summarized by the following data:[134]

Grade point average of students graduating from:

Race of students	Predominantly white high schools	Predominantly Negro high schools
Negro	2.78	2.45
White	3.40	2.75

Thus, those Negro and white students performed best who had come from predominantly white high schools. (It should be kept in mind that the basic data in this study are grade point averages which do not bear great weight when drawing fine distinction between groups of students.)

The Bindman and Johnson studies are consistent in that Negro students were shown to be distinctly unprepared to function adequately at the university. In fact, Johnson's data permit the observation that the white students were only slightly better prepared. White students from white high schools averaged a little less than a "middle C" while the Negro students from white high schools scored a "D" average.

Johnson also found that the Negroes and whites who earned the highest grade point averages had graduated from a single integrated high school. This finding was consistent with his main findings. An unspecified number of Negro and white high scorers, however, were found to come from a single predominantly Negro school. Hence, Johnson and his associates concluded that "predominantly Negro schools seem to be able to provide a quality education."[135]

Such a conclusion seems unwarranted, for several reasons. This exceptional Negro school is listed as enrolling middle class students; the relative success, if it can be documented, thus reflects a class rather than a racial difference. Also, few students are involved in these calculations; these are most highly selected students from a great mass of poorly educated children.

The fact that a handful succeeds is not exceptional; and it has no beneficial impact on those who fail. Following is a compilation, not presented by Johnson:[136]

Predicted and actual grades at the University of Illinois of graduates of 12 Chicago high schools, by race September 1963-February 1965

Origin of students	Predicted grade point average	Actual grade point average	Average percentile ranking in high school graduating class	Number of students	Percent Negro
Six top-ranked high schools	3.44	3.33	69	753	1
Six lowest-ranked high schools	2.10	2.45	90	99	96

The racial differential in scholastic performance is noteworthy.

Several recent studies have dealt with social interaction at southern colleges. In some of these the number of Negro students is so small that interracial contacts affect a very slender fraction of the student bodies. A study of the University of Alabama reported fewer than 1 percent of the students were Negroes; at a north Georgia college, 10 out of 3,000 were Negroes; and at a third only 1 percent were Negroes.[137] Nevertheless, between 1963 and 1966 at the University of Alabama there was a highly significant growth of prointegration sentiment among white students. Muir and McGlamery observed "that those who best knew a Negro playmate (at an earlier age) would be most favorable to integration . . . came as somewhat of a surprise since this relationship is supposedly part of the old South culture."[138] They also discovered that prointegrationists tended to underestimate the strength of their viewpoint on campus. In view of this, the researchers concluded, "it is reasonable to expect not only the gradual liberalization of attitudes reported above, but dramatic changes as situations develop which invite fuller disclosure of one's opinions."[139]

Between the freshman and senior years, attitudes toward Negroes underwent a statistically significant liberalization among white students at a southern university.[140] At the north Georgia college, Cole and associates found no significant change (there were 10 Negro students out of a total of 3,000).

At Millikin University, in Decatur, Ill., Forbes and Gipson compared samples of 20 Negroes with 35 white students. The Negro students, researchers found, "were more accepting of opposing political viewpoints, were lower in anxiety and were no more dogmatic than white students . . ."[141] Markley studied the effects of having a Negro roommate on white students at Northwestern University and Oberlin College. The researchers uncovered an interesting sidelight at Northwestern University which followed a policy of not assigning a Negro roommate to a white student whose home address was in the South.[142] Procedural problems of the sample prevented definitive conclusions from being drawn. Informal indications were, however, that the experience had not greatly affected the white students. Hader's attempt to study a related problem was also stopped short by procedural problems.[143] During

1969-1970, in nearly two-thirds of the integrated dorms at Illinois State University at Normal, one roommate moved out at the close of the first semester. Whites with greater interracial experience tended to remain; for blacks, this factor did not make any difference in the attitude toward a white roommate.[144]

One especially disturbing feature of interracial relations on a number of college campuses was the unprovoked use of force by white students against black students. Examples may be found at Northwestern University[145] and Wisconsin State University at Oshkosh.[146] In some cases, university officials either ignored the violence or were dilatory in dealing with it.

At virtually all-black institutions unprovoked violence by state and local police agencies extended to the killing of black students. This occurred at South Carolina State College at Orangeburg and at Southern University in Baton Rouge, La.[147]

N. Bradley studied the desegregation of seven colleges in Tennessee.[148] The very large sample comprised 583 Negro students. Nearly half were reported as making satisfactory progress even though the mean score for 275 Negro freshman students was below the 20th percentile for college-bound students on the American College Testing (ACT).[148] No real discipline problems were reported. No Negroes belonged to white fraternities or sororities; very few were allowed to live in college dormitories. "There is little, if any, open friction, but there is little real social integration," said a professor to Bradley.[150]

Students stated that racial exclusion or discrimination was the single most unsatisfactory feature of their campus life. On the other hand, when they were asked to list the most satisfactory aspect of their college experience, 60 percent referred to factors with racial overtones:[151]

29.6 percent	Meeting, mixing, understanding, accepting, and learning about different races.
17.4 percent	Being accepted as a person by helpful instructors and/or friendly students.
13.0 percent	Meeting the challenge of competition or coping with whites.

While they stated their greatest difficulty was keeping up academically, Bradley reports that "no special institutional services were provided especially for the Negro undergraduates."[152]

G. Bradley studied close school friendships among Negro high school and college students in Baltimore.[153] "More than twice as many of the college group and three times as many of the secondary school group indicated that their closest friend, ranked as number one, was a Negro . . . (than) indicated that their closest friend similarly ranked, was white." Desegregation was held to have encouraged interracial friendships.

Bindman made student relations the central subject of his inquiry at the University of Illinois. The Negro student, according to Bindman, "feels isolated, alienated, and disaffected from the University System."[154] Few white students initiated any close personal relationships with Negro students and the campus normative structure directed interracial activities into the more impersonal realm of campus life. Here, equality reigned – until it hurt. The overwhelming impersonality of the campus struck Negro students hardest. Not a single Negro belonged to a white fraternity where informal information and academic assistance could have been obtained. Instead, the campus Negro group "is made up of peers with the same paucity of information, and knowledge, particularly about the formal system."[155]

The first two Negro graduates of the University of Georgia experienced indifference, at best, and isolation at worst. During his 2½ years at the university, Hamilton Holmes "had never eaten in a university dining hall, studied in the library, used the gymnasium, or entered the snack bar. No white student had ever visited him and he had never visited a white student.[156]" His classmate, Charlayne Hunter, received many letters of encouragement telling her she was not really alone. "But," commented Miss Hunter, "I look around and I don't see anybody else."

Miss Hunter revisited the University of Georgia 5 years after graduating. More Negro students were enrolled and a Negro admissions counselor, Ben Colebert, had been employed. When black students complained to him of the unfriendliness of white students, and discussed the possible advantage of attending a Negro college, Colebert told them "that you get more awareness of being black here than in a black institution where it's taken for granted."[157] Joe Sales, a black senior, explained to Miss Hunter why only a minority of Negroes on campus belonged to the Black

Students Union: "You see, there's a basic division between those students who come from predominantly black schools and people who went to a white high school. The ones who went to a white high school are more willing to relate."[158] Miss Hunter addressed herself to the cases of two Negro students who spoke with pain of their campus experience: "Joe and Andy are appalled at the treatment they are receiving at the University of Georgia because for the first time in their lives, they are feeling it personally. Discrimination through separate and unequal schooling is not something you feel personally."[159]

North or South, the same themes arose. At Iowa State University, Ames, in 1974, a pervasive feeling of isolation affected the 200 blacks on a campus with 19,000 white students. The quality of human relations frequently puzzled the black newcomer, at least at first. One sophomore, who had lived in Florida and New York City before coming to Ames, described the problem:

> It's kind of hard for a new black student to determine exactly where he stands here. Every person you see is smiling at you. They all want to be buddy-buddy with you. But when it comes down to the nitty-gritty, things are the same like everywhere else.[160]

At West Virginia University, Morgantown, the problems of black students were compounded by the virtual absence of a black community in town. When asked why he had chosen to attend the University of Cincinnati rather than his home State WVU., Curtis Cabbell, a star basketball player, replied: "There's nothing for blacks to do up there when they're not in class or studying. . . Cincinnati has a large black population so I won't have the problems there that I would have at West Virginia."[161]

Over 30 years ago, Boone studied the life of black students at the University of Michigan. Bitterly, he concluded:

> . . . The Negro student in attending a white school may expect to find the denial of unlimited opportunity, the occurrence of social embarrassments, and the concrete proof that American democracy is the white man's democracy – just as he has already experienced in everyday life.[162]

Boone's sentiments continued to be voiced many years later. The higher education of black students – as well as other minorities – remained a tangential concern of the colleges and universities. This lack of concern fed a basic distrust of the institutions by black students.

DESEGREGATION AND INTERACTION

In this section studies of student interaction in the process of desegregation are examined. Following the terminology in preceding chapters, by desegregation is meant a longitudinal view of the same students, wherever possible, under conditions of segregation and the absence of segregation. In a few cases, the comparison is between segregated and nonsegregated communities.

Student interaction across racial boundaries is affected with great force by community attitudes. Almost nowhere in the United States have white communities volunteered to desegregate their schools. Throughout the South – and increasingly, the North – bitter controversy surrounded the entire issue. Usually, the community conflict was terminated only by a court which compelled desegregation. Resistive attitudes by whites, especially, continued to influence the course of events, however, as many children tended to reflect parental attitudes toward desegregation. Instead of continuing to oppose desegregation as such, criticism centered on busing or other mechanical aspects of the desegregation process.

All this took its toll on the ability of children of different races to get on with one another. The remainder of the chapter surveys national and local instances of desegregation to ascertain the fate of student interracial interaction within this unfavorable context.

The NORC study, headed by Crain, analyzed the record of 598 schools located in 103 southern school districts. All had recently desegregated, i.e., in 1971-72. As noted in chapter 6, the NORC study reported that arithmetic test scores for male high school students increased in the schools under study. (All were part of a federally financed aid program known as the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP).) NORC writers, in accounting for the achievement increase, concluded that "we are confident, but by no means certain, that this was because of improvements in the schools' racial climate affecting the motivation of these students."[163] Those schools in which principals and teachers favored integration and associated measures also had students with similar inclinations. The urban schools in the sample developed intergroup programs that seemed especially effective in helping white students accept desegregation. Earlier experience with interracial schooling was found to influence present attitudes toward integration: ". . .In both rural and urban areas, white high school students and both black and white elementary school students have higher prointegration scores if they began integration in early grades."[164]

Attitudes of black and white students were more favorable, as just noted, when attitudes of staff and faculty were supportive of desegregation. Other factors also played a role in attitude formation. Among black students, for example, lower social class went along with more prointegration sentiment; this was especially true in urban areas. On the other hand, "urban blacks – particularly 10th graders, are more prointegration in communities where there has been black civil rights activity."[165] Interestingly, the black civil rights factor also tended to strengthen prointegration attitudes among *white* students. Other factors having the same effect on whites were the presence of an integrated PTA and an integrated student leadership corps. In terms of numbers and proportions, whites tended to have more positive racial attitudes when they formed either a very small or over 60 percent proportion of the student body.

Fifth and 10th graders were asked questions to elicit data on voluntary interracial contacts. They responded affirmatively as follows:[166]

	White	Black
Fifth grade		
Are the three best friends the same race as you?	42.6	51.7
Tenth grade		
Are the three students with whom you talk the most of the same race as you?	18.2	34.8
Have you ever called a student of a different race on the phone?	24.1	39.5
This school year, have you helped a student from another race with school work?	61.2	63.8
This school year, have you asked a student from another race to help you with your homework?	32.2	49.6

". . .The desegregated Southern school," observes Crain, "does too little to welcome its black students."[167] Perhaps one reason for this is the widely held conviction among educators that black students are a monolithic whole. Such a misconception does little to prepare the school to deal individually with black students. Often, for example, a school with many low-income black students will be regarded, without inquiry, as a breeding ground for feelings of alienation. NORC found, however, that "black alienation is not a matter of poverty; the Southern high schools with the most alienated black students are those with middle class blacks."[168] In a study for NORC, Narot reported on the special importance to black female students of the opportunity to participate in school affairs. "In high percentage white schools," writes Narot, "there is a 27 point difference in mean achievement between schools where participation is high and schools where it is low."[169]

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR), HEW study, conducted during spring, 1969 in five southern States, reported that extracurricular activities were open to all in the desegregated schools but that "Negro students often indicated their resentment at losing their leadership positions on transferring to the formerly white school."[170] Further, the

OCR study noted: "Negro students reported considerable insecurity concerning social activities at the desegregated schools... In most of the high schools visited, it was noted by black and white students that the races tended to be separate in the cafeterias, assembly halls, on the school ground, even in classes where seating was optional."[171] Where numbers of Negro students were fairly large, they experienced less insecurity. Where white students were a minority in formerly all-black schools, they exhibited the same "minority characteristics."[172]

During the following 2 years, 1970-71, Federal courts ordered widespread desegregation in the South. Tokenism was no longer judicially acceptable. Because of continuing white opposition to effective desegregation, however, many school boards followed the letter rather than the spirit of the law. In a number of cases, court orders were evaded by one technique or another. In 1970, for example, the National Education Association sent a team to study desegregation in Louisiana. A common occurrence, the team reported, was the maintenance of segregated classrooms in formally desegregated schools. These all-black classes were taught by recently transferred black teachers. With respect to student interaction, the team reported:

> One of the most tragic consequences of desegregation for the transferred black student is the forfeiture of his own sense of school spirit and group identity. In those black schools that are continued in use as a desegregated facility, the same obliteration of black identity occur. Pictures and trophies are removed; the schools, even the most well kept and freshly painted, are renovated and repainted... In one formerly all-black school, a large wall mural depicting the school's history had been painted over.[173]

Another study, conducted by a group of civil rights organizations, found many school systems discriminating against black students in desegregated schools and classes.[174]

Male black students in newly desegregated schools were often welcomed for their athletic prowess. The welcome did not last long:

> When we were football players, they thought something of us... Then when football season was over – don't none of 'em speak to us.[175]

A black graduate of a South Carolina high school reported: "There was one teacher, one English teacher who was truthful and honest, one human being in my 4 years. That whole school was strange."[176]

A survey of the press in 11 Southern States in Spring 1972 reported the occurrence of nearly 20,000 black student demonstrative actions; more than half that number of students had been expelled or suspended; over 2,000 were arrested. Black students protested discriminatory firing or demotions of black faculty and staff as well as inschool racial discrimination in student government and extracurricular affairs.[177] In New Orleans, during the school year 1971-72, Clarke, a professor at Southern University, found that the school system suspended nearly one-sixth of all its black students. Black females were suspended 12 times more frequently than white females.[178] In Dallas, black students were suspended at nearly twice the rate of white students.[179]

The only study of statewide desegregation experience was made some years ago at a time when only token free choice desegregation existed. Chesler and Segal made a comprehensive study of desegregation in Alabama.[180] Their interviewers – all Negro college students – talked during June-August 1966 with a total of 217 Negro students who had attended a white junior high or high school in Alabama during the 1965-66 school year. Their number amounted to more than 40 percent of the entire population of Negro junior and senior high students attending desegregated public schools in Alabama in 1965-66.[181] A control group of 75 Negro students was established; these were persons who lived near a desegregator but who, for one reason or another, had not transferred to the white school. Also interviewed were 39 white teachers who had taught in the desegregated schools.

The desegregators were extremely apprehensive about what reception they would meet in the white school:

> ... Over one-fourth of the Negro students went to school expecting to be beaten or harmed physically... Another 52 percent felt "uneasy" or "worried," but not actually scared.[182]

(These fears were realistic. In Alba, Ala., where two Negro children had desegregated the town's high school, two separate bomb explosions occurred in January 1968.)[183] Chesler and Segal summarized the students' actual experience: "Quite clearly, Negro students experienced considerable indifference and rejection, and often physical and emotional brutality, when they entered white schools."[184] Yet, 15 percent of the desegregators reported "positive reactions" and 74 percent said some whites had acted in a friendly way.[185] Nearly half (48 percent) said they belonged to an interracial school club.

Chesler and Segal compared the desegregators with the control group of nondesegregators. There was no significant difference between the educational levels of the two groups of parents. Both groups of students had significantly high expectations (80 percent v. 65 percent) of attending college. Most significant for the study, the researchers reported that "...desegregators seem to be less negatively prejudiced against whites, and more actively concerned about change and their efforts in a change roles."[186]

This finding is clearly in line with those of Singer, Haggstrom, and Blake.

Had the desegregators' perceptions of white students changed? As the researchers report: "It is clear that before entering the white school Negro youngsters had an unrealistically low estimate of their abilities in relation to white students."[187] But experience is, at times, a great teacher. When desegregators were asked whether, before transferring, they thought white students would be smarter, 63 percent said yes. Only 22 percent still thought so after desegregation. This was a highly significant change. "It is clear," state Chesler and Segal, "that before entering the white school, Negro youngsters had an unrealistically low estimate of their abilities in relation to white students."

(Incidentally, over three quarters of the desegregators reported that the white students turned out to be noisier and less well-behaved than they had expected.)

Contacts with whites outside class were reported by a majority of desegregators; three-quarters of the group regarded at least some of the white students as friends. Did they trust whites more or less since desegregation? More 37 percent; 41 percent said less.

How had the desegregators fared in academic achievement? No test scores or school records were available, and so self-reports of grades were recorded. The following table summarizes the results for desegregators and nondesegregators:[188]

Self-report of change in grades during 2 school years in desegregator and control population

Change	Desegregators (N-197)	Control (N-75)
	percent	percent
Grades increased	11.3	26.6
Grades remained unchanged	28.2	49.3
Grades declined	60.5	24.0

What appears to have been a disastrous change for the worse is probably the very opposite. As Chesler and Segal report: "Overall, 83 percent of the desegregators unequivocally said they gained a lot from being in the white school, and the rest felt they made gains although they had been severely or moderately tempered by sacrifices."[189]

The Chesler-Segal study is rare for its locale, exemplary for its modest aims, and excellent for the rigorous care with which it was carried out. Its findings are rich in implications for desegregation in the North and South.

Three studies have been made in two different North Carolina cities. In Winston-Salem, Morris traced the desegregation of Carver Junior High School which began by court-order in 1970-71. A sweeping plan required thorough cross-busing so that Carver, which had until recently been an all-black school, enrolled 305 blacks and 280 whites. All the whites were bused to the school. (A special feature of Morris' study was that he served as assistant and acting principal of Carver during the year he writes about.)

Initiation of desegregation had been preceded by bitter complaints of many white parents. Weapons were discovered among white students. Indeed, Morris found that some white parents had ordered their children "to cause trouble and problems in an attempt to get the school closed."[190] Two parents later apologized for their actions. Many tiny crises arose, such as feeling hair. A number of black students came up to white students to stroke their hair, having never had the experience. As Morris explains: "After explanation by teachers and administrators, most of the students accepted this touching for what it was – curiosity."[191] Most fights in the school were intraracial rather than interracial. Black students took the lead in stopping the fighting, even when it involved only white students.

The school administration and staff were especially sensitive to interracial romantic liaisons among students. Such relationships were "watched" least they grow serious. When some did – especially involving white girls and black boys – "the students were counseled and in two cases the principal strongly advised the boys to stay away from the girls involved."[192] As in many other desegregated schools, few black girls socialized with white boys.

Student government was a focal point of student tensions. At a schoolwide election during this first year of desegregation, the black majority elected an all-black slate of officers. However, school authorities had other ideas. As Morris reports, in a most candid manner:

> Since it was almost a 1:1 ratio, the administration fixed the election so that when the results were announced, the student government offices were held by a white president and secretary and a black vice president and treasurer. Homerooms were instructed to elect a black and white as their homeroom representatives. The blacks questioned the results for a brief period of time but the elected president included all candidates in his cabinet which seemed to squelch any discontent. Both races cooperated well in the operation of the student government and no problems developed.[193]

On the other hand, the principal took a different step when a three-teacher committee chose cheerleaders. Two squads were selected: one consisted of 10 whites and 2 blacks and the other, 7 whites and 3 blacks. The principal canceled the selections and directed that an equal number of black and white students be placed on each of the squads. Apparently, they cheered happily ever after.

Discipline was also a troublesome matter. The white community as a whole expected black violence at the school. Some parents gave their children knives to carry. Early in the year, fires were set in the school and vandalism was widespread. A pragmatic standard of punishment evolved. In Morris' phrase, ". . . punishments were often based on what had been administered to a student of the opposite race for a similar infraction."[194] The relative absence of absolute standards of discipline made the school appear to be following a go-easy policy. In part, this was undoubtedly correct. Yet, Morris stresses that a great deal of student leadership was coaxed into being by an unreadiness to punish. Much of the success of desegregation in the school resulted from student cooperation. Indeed, Morris concluded: "Students must be given a share of the responsibility in making desegregation work. A major part of the burden must be placed on them. This responsibility provides them with an identity and cohesive spirit."[195]

Woodward studied self-segregation in Northwest Junior High School, also in Winston-Salem. Over 4 years of desegregation – apparently on a free-choice basis – enrollment stood at one-tenth black. She found a highly consistent trend among students of both races to prefer children of their own race.[196]

Mayer and associates conducted a first-rate study of desegregation in Goldsboro, N.C. during 1970-72. They were especially interested in the effect of desegregation on achievement. As was reported in chapter 6, blacks increased achievement in relation to national norms or arrested a decline that had become customary under segregation.[197] On site observers found interracial association proceeding on a relatively easygoing basis. It was evident that blacks were initiating most of the contacts. In the high school, however, blacks tended to occupy a marginal position. While students of both races reported numerous positive experiences, there also were "considerable rudeness and fear of interpersonal conflicts of a violent nature."[198] White students got on far better with teachers than did black students. This is discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

The Dade County, Fl., public schools evaluated desegregation progress during 1970-71. Other than academic achievement, the report touched on issues such as student conflict, absenteeism, and human relations workshops: on student conflict, the report noted:

> Principals have indicated that an average of 31.4 percent of the student body in schools which were student desegregated were very disruptive... Both behavior problems racial in origin and vandalism instances thought to be racial in origin were only slightly related to shifts in the student population, i.e., desegregation. Where they were related, the relationship was usually found in schools which had been heavily "other" [i.e., white] prior to desegregation.[199]

The more heavily black schools were found to have lower student morale. Absenteeism was not related either to the degree of busing or to the shifts of teachers and students. No evidence was found that human relations programs contributed to the success of desegregation. The evaluators note that human relations teams were not employed in the schools experiencing the greatest degree of desegregation.

Hagar studied desegregation of the Matoaca High School in Chesterfield County, Va. During 1968-69, enrollment was 62.5 percent white; the school had operated for 5 years. A distinctive feature of the black students was their relatively high socioeconomic status. A number of black parents were professionals. While 129 11th and 12th graders made up the sample, Hagar interviewed 8 students, all of whom had spent 4 years at Matoaca. "It was unanimously agreed," writes Hagar, "that the areas of student involvement and interracial relationships had both grown and matured since the early years of the school."[200] In school activities, blacks were accepted in leadership roles. In fact, black students with white friends were most frequently chosen as leaders by white and black students. Students whose social circle remained within one or the other race were relatively uninterested in extracurricular activities.

Little interracial interaction occurred in the classroom or after school. Left to their own devices, students tended to work with or sit near others of their race. Teachers tried to change this from time to time. The following tabulation show that when group student-directed assignments were made, students tended to stay inside racial boundaries:[201]

	Cases of racial mixture			
Method of assignment	Always	Frequently	Seldom	Never
Teacher directed	12	17	9	0
Student directed	2	13	21	2

In other words, out of a total of 76 cases, teacher-directed assignments involved almost twice as much racial mixture as student-directed assignments. Hagar found that black and white students cooperated best in those classrooms in which "noncontroversial" discussions occurred. She adds, "subject areas requiring group effort, such as laboratory work in the sciences, seemed to generate more friction in peer relationships."[202]

Williams studied 20 black students who, on a free-choice basis, attended a school in tiny Vienna, Dooly County, Ga. While the grades of most of them were lower than in the all-black school they left, according to Williams the "students felt this was not a result of teacher bias, but primarily due to superior instruction."[203] Given the token presence of black students and the higher educational expectations, black students hesitated to speak in class for fear they would give a wrong answer. All "felt conspicuous" in class. The difficult position the children were in is highlighted by the occasional "total rejection" by students and teachers. The minimal level of respect shown the black students can be guessed at from Williams' comment that despite the rejection "all teachers referred to them by their names." Black parents and relatives of the black children were not fearful for the welfare of the children. At the same time a number had doubts about the propriety of blacks attending white schools. Williams observes that "the administrative efforts within desegregated schools are not made for the purpose of helping Negroes, but to have discipline in the school."[204]

In Fort Worth, Tex., Evans explored desegregation effects over 1 year (1970-1971). He found that while white children increasingly chose black and Mexican American children to play with, the latter two groups chose white children less.[205]

Felice studied the consequences of a court-ordered busing plan in Waco, Tex. A close connection was found between achievement of black children and the degree of perceived racial hostility at the new school. Higher academic achievement went along with numerous interracial friendships. Felice observes that "positive and cordial intergroup relations may be the most important step in the effort to achieve equality of educational opportunity."[206]

In Angleton, Tex., during the first year of high school desegregation, the dropout rate of Negro students rose from 2.3 percent to 7.0 percent while the rate for white students remained unchanged.[207] By implication, Bryant suggests that the increased rate was accounted for by the pressure of heightened academic competition of white students. (No mention was made of special help for the lagging Negro students.) A contrasting finding was reached by Hunt and Hardt in their study of Negro boys in an Upward Bound program. Increases in test scores of Negroes were significant for those measures "primarily concerned with academic adequacy and self-evaluation–which is somewhat surprising in light of the white superiority in academic achievement."[208]

In a South Carolina study, McWhirt found at the end of a year of desegregation that "interracial contact was conductive in bringing about changes in the attitudes of the Negro students in the integregated school. . . The highly favorable self-concept rating of the Negro students indicates that they did not submit to self-depreciation in order to gain acceptance from whites."[209] White children did not experience any lessening of anti-Negro prejudice. Bienvenu found in a Florida high school that lack of acceptance by white students as well as academic difficulties helped make desegregation an anxiety-producing experience.[210] In Delaware, Harootunian and Morse found that Negro students in segregated schools had the highest anxiety levels.[211] No simple statement can be made about the effect of desegregation on anxiety. According to Epps, the facts that lower class children display more anxiety than middle class children and that Negro children generally display more anxiety than white children are not at all connected with segregation or desegregation.[212]

Six studies were made of five different places in New York State. The effects of desegregation on behavior problems were investigated by Banks and Di Pasquale in Buffalo, N.Y. Four groups were asked their opinions regarding behavior problems during the first year of desegregation. Here are the findings, by percent:[213]

Opinions regarding the behavior problems during the initial year of desegregation

Reaction	Principals (percent)	Teachers (percent)	Negro students (percent)	White students (percent)
Somewhat fewer or significantly fewer	13	29	49	16
No change	13	24	34	81
More or significantly more	74	47	17	3

The contrast between students, on the one hand, and principals and teachers, on the other, is striking. One wonders whether surveys of "student unrest" have not depended too heavily on responses by administrators and teachers.

Parents were asked how their children's interest in school had been affected by desegregation. The findings were as follows, by percent:[214]

Reaction	Negro	White
Improved or greatly improved	60	11
Stayed the same	31	86
Declined or declined a great deal	9	3

These opinions are consonant with the academic realities of the school. On the other hand, McDill and associates have noted the almost universal enthusiasm by parents for experimental programs in general.[215]

A year and a half after the Banks study, Laing surveyed principals of receiving schools in Buffalo. Two responses suggest special problems of the bused children in this token program. One principal responded: "Inner city children remaining for lunch are somewhat isolated at this hour due to the fact that neighborhood youths return home." Another wrote: "Though lessened, merchants in the area continue to complain of unsupervised children during the lunch hour resulting in periodic closing of certain stores at this time." At another school, administrative staff refused to take any organized actions to encourage integration of the resident and bused-in students: "School authorities prefer not to force children into an artifical situation."[216]

In Rochester, N.Y., Barber studied the effect of an open enrollment plan on racial prejudices of children. Negro children transferred to school A, a predominantly white school in the city, and to school C, a predominantly white school in the suburbs. Barber reports:

> Testimony from open enrollment Negro students... indicated a universally felt fear or uncertainty during their first few months at school A and a continuing lack of assurance in dealing with a resentful white majority. It may well be these pressures of insecurity and feelings of alienation are at least in part responsible for more distrust of whites and less self-esteem among open enrollment students.[217]

It may be added that Barber's observations were made during the 1966-67 school year.

White teachers were found to be contributing to the tensions:

> Their reactions, as guarded as some of them be, have tended to reinforce the white student's anti-Negro feelings... The open hostilities exhibited by some teachers at [faculty] meetings, their lack of tact and their stereotyped, vituperative humor must certainly be communicated to students. At the same time, of course, Negro students at school A find evidence to support their anti-white prejudices because of this kind of negative communication.[218]

Barber added that a majority of teachers and white parents were antagonistic to the desegregation program, preferring to wait until changed housing patterns would permit "natural" desegregation.[219]

Willie conducted an unusually perceptive study of interaction in four newly desegregated schools in Syracuse; two were elementary and two junior high schools. Among the most notable features of the inquiry were two: (1) observers in the classroom remained over the entire school year, thus affording Willie a mass of unique data, and (2) both race and newness of the presence of the black children were studied by including in the research a number of white children whose families had just moved into the area. The most compelling finding – to be discussed in the next chapter – related to the critical role of administrative planning and leadership along with the contribution of the classroom teacher.

With reference to white students in the receiving schools, Willie suggests the greatest contribution of the desegregation process might be in dismissing "for all time in the minds of some whites the myth of the inherent inferiority of blacks."[220] This interpretation is very consistent with the work of Jorgensen. (See ch. 7, pp. 131-133.) Two general conclusions from the study were drawn by Willie. One, both groups of "new" students–those who were bused and those who moved–experienced similar problems with the resident students. Two, teachers tended to classify white neighborhood children as better integrated than black bused students. Yet, both groups of new students felt equally well accepted.

Socioeconomic status means relatively little. Tentatively, Willie concluded that low status "tends to impede the assimilation of some new children into a new school setting but has no effect upon most of the children"[221] The school's educational environment exceeded social status as a determinant of interracial interaction. On the playground and in the classroom, cliques with a racial cast at the start of the school year had all but dissolved by year's end.

Willie cautions against expections of immediate success. He wrote:

> In spite of the hostile climate of Lincoln or the laissez faire setting at Monroe, the reassigned white and black children began to become a part of their new schools during the latter half of the school year. This indicates that there may be a development process to integration moving at its own pace. . .[222]

It should be noted, however, that in the other two schools in which staff and faculty were better prepared to welcome the newcomers, success was prompt – if not instantaneous.

Student interaction in a New York City metropolitan area school was studied by Moreno. Using a sample of 263 black and white K-4 children, she found that white children who had attended desegregated schools since kindergarten entered into social relationships with black children much more readily than did white children who had begun school in an all-white setting.[223]

Schlesinger and D'Amore wrote a retrospective account of desegregation in a White Plains, N.Y., school, beginning with 1964. They point to modest though essential progress by white children at the end of the first year: "The white kids had begun to think about the racial problem and had been forced to recognize its existence. In their dealings with each other, they had to distinguish between individuals. . ."[224] The black children, who seem to have constituted a small part of the enrollment, were kept at the margin of things in the school. Schlesinger and D'Amore worked hard at understanding the black children. Many white teachers were puzzled at what they saw as "nonconformity and senseless defiance."[225] The writers, however, now see the same action as part of the children's "fight for survival." In class many of the black children were not willing to discuss their homes and their parents. As they were kept out of the school's mainstream, they also became more conscious of their ethnic solidarity and identity. "Much of the behavior of the black children in a predominantly white school," declare Schleshger and D'Amore, "is part of an attempt to keep theselves *intact*."[226] Few other writers on the subject have tried to view the desegregation process from the viewpoint of black youths in the context of a racist society.

Three places in California have been the subject of desegregation studies of interaction – Riverside, Berkeley, and San Francisco. Gerard and associates found that after 4 years, minority children in desegregated classrooms in Riverside "are not being fully integrated into the work structure of the classroom."[227] Friendship choices were most frequently expressed within ethnic groups; this did not change over the 4 years. The higher the social class position of white children, the less they had to do with minority classmates. Minority children from upper social levels interacted more frequently with their white peers. White avoidance of minority peers was significant, whether or not the minority children were high achievers. Indeed, Gerard reports that "overall, the minority pupils in the highest achieving third whose predesegregation achievement scores are comparable to the white average are receiving fewer work choices from whites than the lowest achieving third of white students."[228] Being accepted by white children influences the achievement of minority children. Thus, considering only minority students of above average achievement, those who were accepted by their white classmates did not experience any change in achievement level while those who were not accepted actually suffered a drop in scores.

Why was there not an improvement of student interracial acceptance over 4 years? Several alternative explanations were canvassed by the researchers. They "lean", however, toward an interpretation highlighting the role of the teacher. Stated simply, they suggest that teachers as a whole failed to welcome, if they did not reject, the minority children. The white students took their lead from the teachers. (In the next chapter, this is explored in more detail.)

In and of itself, according to Gerard and associates, cleavage in the classroom need not preclude achievement by minority children. For minority children to learn under such circumstances, however, two preconditions are required: (1) the subgroup must not be regarded as inferior in activities valued by all, and (2) there must be enough minority classmates to afford close and satisfying relations. Typically, neither one obtained in the Riverside classroom. Instead, most minority youngsters lagged considerably in academic achievement and were enrolled in classrooms on a near-token basis. "Under these adverse circumstances," the researchers conclude, "the child's only academic salvation would lie in social acceptance by the white majority, so that he would have a sufficiently large, nonstigmatized and congenial comparison group against which to compare himself."[229] This did not happen in Riverside.

In Berkeley, Marascuilo conducted three studies of the city's single high school, in 1965, 1966, and 1970. Until 1964, Berkeley's junior high schools – as well as its elementary schools – were segregated. The high school graduating class of 1970 was the first which had gone through the desegregated junior high, beginning in 1964. Marscuilo found the high school not socially integrated: "Teachers and counselors alike agreed that the student body was generally divided along racial lines and that this division was particularly observable in social situations."[230] Few close interracial friendships had developed, despite 6 years of desegregated schooling. Whites tended to stay away from school dances. Many of the friendships that did cross color lines remained within common socioeconomic levels. A somewhat unexpected finding was that poorer whites had more black friends than did whites from wealthier families.[231] The least social contact occurred between Asian and black students; while white students grew more favorable toward blacks over the high school years, Asians grew less favorable. During junior high school days, fights or quarrels among students were daily occurrences. In the high school, however, they practically disappeared. Among black male students, who were socially integrated to a greater degree than were black female students, less violence occurred.

Another study of Berkeley was done by Marascuilo and Levin.[232] They found that the "same" situation was perceived differently by Negro and white students in a newly desegregated school. When students were asked whether members of both races mixed "often" in the school, 38 percent of the whites and 46 percent of the Negroes said yes. When asked whether mixing occurred "sometimes," the affirmative answers were 51 percent and 43 percent. The researchers note: ". . . The number of new friends made from the other race is a more important determinant of perceived social mixing than is the race of the perceiver. . . Students who had made many friends from other races liked school better, liked their teachers better, and liked their classmates better."[233]

Sachdeva studied interracial interaction among students in two Berkeley junior high schools. Over a year, he found that personal contact led to improved interracial attitudes and more interracial friendships. It is not the contact as such, cautions Sachdeva, that leads to these effects. More important is the condition that contact occur "in situations where institutional definitions minimize racial status differences. . ."[234] Since teachers and staff were "sold" on integration, they were helping define the institution as welcoming and helping children.[235]

Elementary schools in San Francisco were desegregated by court order in 1971. Student interaction was measured by a test of ethnocentrism and a sociometric device. Over the period, December 1971 to May 1972, third graders did not change in ethnocentric attitudes. Among sixth graders, however, the number of "high" ethnocentrist choices declined by one-seventh. Sociometric choices on the third-grade level centered less on own-race and more on other-race children. (Whites continued to choose own-race children as frequently as earlier.) At the sixth grade, white, black, and Asian children also tended to shift their preferences to other-race children. When choices on both grade levels are continued, there is a general shift toward increased selection of other-race children. Spanish-speaking students tended, though not significantly, to maintain their rate of own-race selections.

Attendance patterns at both grade levels were also studied. Absenteeism increased. Slightly the Black students, however, showed an overall decrease; those who walked to their desegregated school reduced absenteeism by 2.7 days. On the sixth-grade level, similar trends were evident; absenteeism in general increased, a somewhat larger rise for bused than for nonbused students; and a decrease for black students.[236] Attendance patterns as a whole demonstrate rather clearly that desegregation had a beneficial effect.

Data on suspensions raise several questions. Suspensions in 1970-71 (i.e., before desegregation) compared with those in 1971-72 show black third and sixth graders were suspended at more than twice their proportion in total enrollment during both years. In the lower grade the proportion of total suspensions accounted for by blacks fell somewhat, but among black sixth graders it rose.[237] An even more somber set of figures emerges upon further analysis. (These calculations were done by the present writer, from statistics contained in an official school system report.) During the 2-year period, about 1 out of 14 black third-graders was suspended. In sixth-grade, however, the situation was far worse. In 1970-71 suspensions among blacks were more than one of every seven; the next year the rate nearly doubled to virtually *one-third.* [238]

Data for 61 schools during 1973-74 tell a parallel story although the two sets of figures are not directly comparable. The most recent study covers all students in 61 schools rather than only third and sixth graders in all schools. Again, blacks were suspended at more than twice their proportion in enrollment. In addition, the more prolonged the suspension, the greater the disparity suffered by black students:[239]

Duration	Percent black
One-day suspensions	37
Two-day suspensions	68
Three-day suspensions	90
Recurrent suspendees	75

Suspension experience in San Francisco under desegregation was comparable with that in other cities, such as Dallas and New Orleans. San Francisco presents a puzzling picture of a high degree of positive student interracial interaction and rising attendance among black students, but also of high and rising rates of suspension of black students.

Three studies have been made of interaction under conditions of more or less token desegregation via voluntary busing arrangements in the Boston area.

Teele examined Operation Exodus, a program of transporting black children from Boston to a nearby suburb.[240] He found evidence to support the contention that: (1) children in Exodus achieved more as a result of the desegregation experience, and (2) the children's feeling of acceptance facilitated the greater achievement. There were many technical problems in conducting the study; its findings, however, were in no sense novel.

Meltzer studied 250 ninth-graders who had participated for from 1 to 3 years in a voluntary busing program, Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO). The students in the sample attended eight schools in outlying suburbs to which they were transported from Boston. Meltzer was interested to learn the effect of desegregation on interpresonal skills. He found that the longer a student attended a desegregated classroom, the more mature were his "interpersonal cognitive skills."[241] But this held more for white than for black students. The latter, for reasons of past experience, do not regard the interracial classroom as a novel setting. For white students, interracial interaction is much more likely to be unfamiliar. Apparently, black students are compelled by circumstance to learn very early "how to get along" in the racial order.

Useem studied the impact of 240 black students who were bused from Boston to schools in nine surrounding communities. This was a METCO project. Since on average fewer than 30 black students attended a suburban school, the effort can only be called token. Still, definite effects were found by Useem. One-third of the sample white students had at least one close friend who was black. The more black friends they had, the more likely were white students to have positive attitudes toward METCO. Interestingly, classroom contact with black students in the busing program was especially productive of positive feelings among downwardly mobile white males. The METCO students themselves continued to express strong support for the program over the year 1968-69 while at the same time consolidating their group solidarity. In other words, black consciousness developed along with integration.

The nine schools differed greatly in attitudes of white students toward METCO. "In those schools," reports Useem, "where the principal did little to positively sanction the program and to promote interracial harmony, the attitudes of the white students toward METCO was relatively negative."[242] A social class factor seemed to operate. Upper and middle class white students seemed to orient more favorably to METCO. Useem suggests a reason for the general antipathy of lower class whites to the program:

> . . .White students who may be frustrated because of their low status both inside and outside of school may take it out on the METCO students who serve as convenient and vulnerable scapegoats. The probability of such scapegoating may actually be increased when a desegregation program is only a token effort. . .[243]

It may be recalled that Marascuilo found at Berkeley High School that more lower class than middle class whites had black friends. This finding, however, does not contradict Useem's findings on METCO. As her concluding sentence in the quotation suggests, numbers are extremely important. While in METCO, black enrollment rarely approached even 1 percent, in Berkeley there were equal numbers of black and white. To be sure, desegregation is more than numbers. This is far, however, from saying that numbers are unimportant.

In the study of Project Concern, in Hartford, Conn., Wood reported summarily that "urban and suburban children were involved in a socioeducational experiment where mutual acceptance was not a problem and where positive social interaction between white and non-white, deprived and not-so-deprived was at an extremely high level in both directions."[244] In Moorefield's study of Kansas City, it will be recalled, desegregation did not result in improved academic achievement. Some light on that outcome might be shed by an examination of social interaction inside the classroom. Nine out of 10 Negro parents stated that "positive relationships" existed between their bused-in children and those in the receiving school.[245] Sociometric data showed, however, that three-quarters of the bused-in Negro children were rated low acceptance by the children regularly in attendance at the receiving schools.[246] Two-thirds of the bused-in children were regarded as "aggressive" by the regular students.[247] Higher academic self-concept by Negro children resulted from being accepted by the white children.[248]

In September 1971 as a consequence of a Federal court order, the public schools of Kalamazoo, Mich., desegregated by using two-way busing. This was anything but token. During Spring 1971, a study was conducted to establish baselines for another study to be made 1 year after desegregation. In the first study, 97 classrooms were involved; in the second, 45. Trained classroom observers gathered data on the spot. Concerned with verbal interaction patterns, they solicited student opinions by questionnaire.

In the predesegregation study, verbal interaction patterns in the high school indicated considerably more structured proceedings in racially mixed than in all-white classrooms. Children in all-white elementary classrooms preceived their classmates as more friendly than did white children in predominantly white or black classrooms. Black children tended more than whites to view their classmates as unfriendly; they also liked school less. Among high school students, racial distinctions in opinions were not discernible.

During the year of desegregation, both in elementary and secondary schools, classrooms became more structured: ". . . There was less total student talk . . . student-initiated talk and student-to-student verbal interaction."[249] Taking all students together, attitudes toward other students grew less positive. An exception was the dominant opinion expressed by black elementary students who viewed their present classmates as friendlier than those of the predesegregation year. Another positive element: black students who had been leaders in predominantly black schools continued in those roles in desegregated schools.

Nowak reported on a study of a small-scale voluntary program in Champaign, Ill. The sample consisted of 51 black secondary students. While over three-fifths felt unwelcome in the white neighborhood housing both schools, they nevertheless found the in school experience gratifying. Two-thirds report trying out for school activities. Some 84 percent said they had made friends with at least one white student. Over four-fifths regarded the teacher as willing to give them special help when asked to do so.[250]

CONCLUSION

Since 1940 some 50 studies have been made of student interaction under conditions of interraciality. On the basis of evidence in the 46 studies reviewed in this chapter, it may be stated with high confidence that interracial interaction usually leads to the development of positive racial attitudes. Studies of student disorders in interracial schools suggest strongly that institutional resistance to educational change in the single most abrasive factor in generating disorders. This fact has stimulated self-organization of black students along ethnic lines as a political counterweight to the inability of the schools, especially in large cities, to present a more meaningful education.

A few studies and an undetermined number of practical classroom efforts have been made regarding means of combatting the racist conception that minority children are less capable of learning. Resourceful teachers, principals, and researchers have begun to build into the classroom structure new practices designed to raise expectations of achievement by all children, including minority children.

On the higher education level the problems found in elementary and secondary schools are enlarged. Interracial interaction in the colleges and universities is hardly more than a figure of speech for, in most cases, only token numbers of minority students are present. Undoubtedly, a major reason for this is that the "paydirt" of careers in the American economy lies largely at the base of higher education.

In this chapter 39 studies regarding interaction and desegregation were reviewed. In most of the cases, the interracial interaction brought on by desegregation produced positive racial attitudes among blacks and/or whites. Tokenism was not a factor encouraging interaction but neither was it an absolute bar to the emergence of positive racial interaction. Leadership by staff and faculty emerged in many studies as a critical factor. In more recently desegregated schools, where representative numbers of blacks and whites are involved, the importance of student involvement and responsibility for the school's program was found to be vital.[251] Repeatedly, the principle of "some leads to more" was documented. In all but a few cases a history of having attended a desegregated school facilitated easier interaction in another desegregated school.

Black students in interracial and desegregated schools are shown to be far more resilient and capable of autonomous action than is widely supposed. Some commentators, black and white, have cautioned that black children's self-conceptions are too fragile for the strains of desegregation. The present evidence suggests otherwise as do the findings of chapter six.

The personal cruelties attendant upon desegregation have diminished in number over the century since Charlotte Forten wrote in her diary the entry quoted on the first page of this chapter. At the same time, each slight hurts as much ever.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *A Free Negro in the Slave Era. The Journal of Charlotte L. Forten*, Ed. Ray Allen Billington (New York: Collier, 1961), p. 74.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 75 (emphasis in original).

[3] Horace Mann Bond, "The Extent and Character of Separate Schools in the United States," *Journal of Negro Education*, July 1935, p. 326.

[4] Meyer Weinberg, *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 38.

[5] Bettye Sledge, "Black Education in Evanston Public Schools: A Look at the Twenties and Thirties," an interview with Melvin Smith, *Integrated Education*, 12 (September-October 1974), p. 28.

[6] Joan H. Criswell, *A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom* (New York: Archives of Psychology, January 1939).

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[8] Robin M. Williams, Jr., and Margaret W. Ryan, eds., *Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954), p. 244.

[9] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960).

[10] Donald N. Lombardi, "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, Spring 1963.

[11] Theodore F. Dunn, *Assumed Racial Similarity as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration* (Doctoral dissertation, American University, 1958), abstract in *Dissertation Abstracts*, XIX, 1959, p. 2533.

[12] Claye, *A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro*, pp. 87-88.

[13] Robert J. Dwyer, "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Sociology*, March 1958.

[14] Hilda Taba, *School Culture Studies of Participation and Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955), p. 95.

[15] Staten W. Webster, *Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960); see, also Webster, "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52 (1961).

[16] Haggstrom, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," pp. 20-21.

[17] Cleveland A. Thomas, "The Independent School and Desegregation," *School Review*, 69 (1961), p. 272.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[19] Frank F. Lee, *Negro and White in Connecticut Town* (New York: Bookman, 1961).

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[22] I.N. Berlin, "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," *Saturday Review*, June 15, 1963.

[23] Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," *Journal of Secondary Education*, February 1967; an earlier article by the same author restates the same argument: "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," *Education Digest*, April 1965.

[24] Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, *Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals* (New York: Wiley, 1966), p. 51.

[25] Clark and Plotkin, *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges*, p. 29.

[26] Nancy H. St. John, "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," *Sociology of Education*, Summer 1964.

[27] Jonsson, *Maternal, Teacher and Pupil Attitudes Toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools* (Berkeley: Berkeley Unified District, October 1966), p. 19.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[29] Teele, Jackson, and Mayo, "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," p. 305.

[30] Leonard Gordon, *An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-660). See, also, Gordon, "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," *Integrated Education*, June-July 1965.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[33] Aaron Lipton, "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," *Integrated Education*, June-July 1965, p. 15.

[34] Gordon, p. 129.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 165.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 233.

[38] June M. Handler, *An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2804).

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

[40] Henry K. Kaplan and Anthony J. Matkom, "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," *Psychology in the Schools*, April 1967.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 183.

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 184.

[44] Roderick W. Pugh, "A Comparative Study of the Adjustment of Negro Students in Mixed and Separate High Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, 12(1943)616.

[45] Robert L. Williams and Spurgeon Cole, "Scholastic Attitudes of Southern Negro Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter 1969, p. 75. See also Williams, "Cognitive and Affective Components of

Southern Negro Students' Attitude Towards Academic Integration," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 76(1968) 107-111.

[46] Robert Houston Beecher, *A Study of Social Distance Among Adolescents of Ethnic Minorities* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968), pp. 81-83. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 780).

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[48] Fred Janney, Sharon Mallory, Richard Rossitto, and John Simon, "Conformity as a Function of Race and Age," *Psychological Reports*, 25(1969)596.

[49] Ronald Lester Mock, *The Relationship Among Children Between Conformity and the Racial Composition of Small Quasi-Groups* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968), pp. 75-76. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3658).

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 124.

[51] Frank Wheeler Schneider, *Differences Between Negro and White School Children in Conforming Behavior* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968), p. 30 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17,040). See, also, same author, "Conforming Behavior of Black and White Children," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16(1970) 466-471.

[52] *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[55] Andrew Lewis O'Connor III, *The Relationship of Imitation to Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement of Negro and White First Grades Pupils in Integrated Classes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967), p. 50. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13, 023.)

[56] Radke, Trager, and Davis, "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," p. 377.

[57] Marion Radke, Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg, "Racial Attitudes of Children," *Sociometry*, 13(1950) 164, 166.

[58] Charles Au Hildebrandt, *The Relationship of Some Personal and Social Variables of School Children to Preference for Mixed Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962), p. 7. (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2503).

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 32, 34, and 35.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[61] Paul Gordon Whitmore, Jr., *A Study of School Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956), p. 33. (University Microfilms Order No. 20, 501.)

[62] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Marianne Amarel, and Nancy Ames, "A Distance Measure of Racial Attitudes in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Psychology in the Schools*, October 1969, p. 385.

[63] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Bertram L. Koslin, John Cardwell, and Richard Pargament, "A Quasi-disguised and Structured Measure of Schoolchildren's Racial Preferences," paper delivered at annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1969, p. 5.

[64] Sandra Cohen Koslin, Bertham L. Koslin, Richard Pargament, and Harvey Waxman, "Effects of School Balance on Racial Attitudes," no date, p. 4. See, also, same authors, "Classroom Racial Balance and Students' Interracial Attitudes," *Sociology of Education*, 45(February 1972), pp. 386-407.

[65] Sophia Fagin McDowell, *The Willingness of Negro Youths to Associate with Whites* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967), p. 27.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[68] See, also, Daniel U. Levine and Norman S. Fiddmont, "Integration Is Up to Date in Kansas City," *Integrated Education*, 7(1969) 3-16.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[72] Delores Griffin Briggs, *Deviations from Standard English in Papers of Selected Alabama Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968), pp. 128, 129, 133, and 143. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-6528).

[73] Wessman, Evaluation of Project ABC, p. 116.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 196.

[77] Morrill M. Hall and Harold W. Gentry, "Isolation of Negro Students in Integrated Public Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Spring 1969, p. 158.

[78] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools*, I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 111.

[79] *Ibid.*, II, p. 42.

[80] See *ibid.*, I, table 6, p.93.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[82] Bernard Caffrey and Clarine Jones, "Racial Attitudes of Southern High School Seniors," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 79 (1969), p. 293.

[83] William F. Smith, *A Study of Biracial Interaction in a Racially Balanced School* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970), p. 141.

[84] Antonio Martinez-Monfort, *Racial Attitudes of High School Students Attending Desegregated Schools in a Southern Metropolitan Area* (Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1970), p. 35.

[85] Murelle G. Harrison, Lawrence A. Messe, and Gary E. Stollak, "Effects of Racial Composition and Group Size on Interaction Patterns in Preschool Children," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association*, 6(1971), p. 326.

[86] Noele Krenkel, *Self-Concept and Interaction Patterns of Children in a Desegregated School* (Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco, 1972), p. 43.

[87] Mary Anne Lachat, *A Description and Comparison of the Attitudes of White High School Seniors Toward Black Americans in Three Suburban High Schools: An All White, A Desegregated, and An Integrated High School* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972), pp. 218-20.

[88] Ramona M. Kaalberg, *Racial Preferences of Second, Fourth, and Sixth Grade Negro and Caucasian Girls in Hypothetical and Actual Social Situations* (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College, 1972), p. 70.

[89] Martin Patchen and James D. Davidson with Gerhard Hofmann and William R. Brown, *Patterns and Determinants of Inter-Racial Interaction in the Indianapolis Public High Schools* (West Lafayette, Ind.: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, July 1973).

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 292.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 295.

[97] See Meyer Weinberg, "From Discipline to Disorder," *Intergroup*, 2(February 1972), 4-5.

[98] Huey P. Newton with the assistance of J. Herman Blake, *Revolutionary Suicide* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), p. 50.

[99] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[100] Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice, *Report of the . . . Student Unrest Survey* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, September 1969), p. 3.

[101] See Robert J. Havighurst, Frank L. Smith, and David E. Wilder, *A Profile of the Large-City High School* (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, November 1970) and Stephen K. Bailey, *Disruption in Urban Secondary Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971).

[102] Meyer Weinberg, "White Children in the Desegregation Process," *Integrated Education*, 12(July-August 1974), p. 41.

[103] Havighurst, Smith, and Wilder, *A Profile of the Large-City High School*, p. 106.

[104] See, also, Ronald L. Abrell and Charles C. Hanna, "High School Unrest Reconsidered," *High School Journal*, 54(1970-1971), pp. 396-404 and Kenneth L. Fish, *Conflict and Dissent in the High Schools* (New York: Bruce, 1970).

[105] Everett Worcester and Carl Ashbaugh, "Socioeconomic Status, Ethnic Background, and Student Unrest," *Clearing House*, 47(October 1972), p. 90.

[106] Gary Alan Houmes, *A Study of Racial Disruption in Selected Large-City High Schools As Related to Conflicting Black and White Students' Educational Expectations* (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972), p. 70.

[107] Lillie Marie Lockhart, *An Analysis of Variables Which Tend To Be Associated With Race Related Acts of Violence at Specific Schools in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania from 1967 to 1970* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972), p. 27.

[108] Paul Ritterband and Richard Silberstein, "Group Disorders in the Public Schools," *American Sociological Review* 38(August 1973), pp. 466-477. See, also, same authors, "More on School Disorders," *ibid.*, 39(February 1974), pp. 135-137.

[109] James P. Pitts, "Group Disorders in the Public Schools: A Comment," *American Sociological Review*, 39(February 1974), p. 135.

[110] See James P. Pitts, *A Case Study: Analysis of Black High School Students—A Generation of Change* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971).

[111] Barbara Caley, "How a School Fails," *Integrated Education*, 7(September-October 1969), p. 11.

[112] Frank M. Ochberg and Edison Tridsett, "Administrative Responses to Racial Conflict in a High School," *Community Mental Health Journal*, 6(1970), p. 472.

[113] Newton, *Revolutionary Suicide*, p. 20.

[114] Aaron Lipton, "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," *Integrated Education*, 3(June-July 1965), p. 14. See, also, by same author, "Classroom Grouping and Integration," *ibid.*, 2(February-March 1964), pp. 49-54.

[115] A probing article by a parent of children attending school in the district is Walter Goodman's "Busing for Integration Is Working Well in Central 7 School District—Knock Wood," *New York Times Magazine*, April 9, 1972. See, also, Naomi and Arnold Buchheimer, *Equality through Integration. A Report on Greenburgh School District No. 8* (New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1965), Ellen W. Buzbee, *Suburban Schools Confront Urban Problems* (White Plains, N.Y.: American Jewish Committee, 1968); EQUAL. "Observing a Princeton Plan in Operation," EQUAL Newsletter, June 1964; and Jane Weiner, *Desegregation Evolves Into Integration in Greenburgh* 8(New York: New York State Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, 1966).

[116] Doris R. Entwisle and Murray Webster, Jr., "Raising Children's Performance Expectations," *Social Science Research*, 1(1972) 147-158.

[117] Doris R. Entwisle and Murray Webster, Jr., "Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups," *Sociology of Education* 47(Summer 1974), p. 316.

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 315.

[119] See Elizabeth G. Cohen, "Interracial Interaction Disability," *Human Relations*, 25(1972)9-24; same author, "Modifying the Effects of Social Structure," *American Behavioral Scientist*, 16(July-August 1973) 861-879; and Cohen and Susan S. Roper, "Modification of Interracial Interaction Disability: An Application of Status Characteristic Theory," *American Sociological Review*, 37(December 1972) 643-657.

[120] Cohen, "Modifying the Effects of Social Structure," p. 869.

[121] Cohen, "Interracial Interaction Disability," p. 21.

[122] Susan Stavert Roper, "Race and Assertive Classroom Behavior," *Integrated Education*, 10(September-October 1972), p. 28.

[123] Entwisle and Webster, "Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups," p. 315.

[124] For a critical comment on this point, see James D. Preston and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr., "On Modification of Interracial Interaction," *American Sociological Review*, 39(April 1974), 283-285; this is followed by a rejoinder by Cohen and Roper, pp. 285-286.

[125] Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges* (New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963), p. 26.

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[127] Aaron M. Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 65-7076).

[128] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[129] *Ibid.*, p. 65.

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

[132] See, also, Aaron Bindman, "Pre-College Preparation of Negro College Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, (Fall 1966).

[133] Jessica Henderson Daniel, *A Study of Negro Sororities at a University with Marginal Integration* (Master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1967), p. 42.

[134] Norman J. Johnson, Robert Wyer, and Neil Gilbert, "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," *Phylon*, Fall 1967, pp. 223-224.

[135] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[136] *Integrated Education*, August-September 1966, p. 10.

[137] See Donald E. Muir and C. Donald McGlamery, "The Evolution of Desegregation Attitudes of Southern University Students," *Phylon*, 29(1968), 105-117; Spurgeon Cole, Jay Steinberg, and G.J. Burkheimer, "Prejudice and Conservatism in a Recently Integrated Southern College," *Psychological Reports*, 23(1968), 149-150; and Bernard Caffrey, Simms Anderson II, and Janet Garrison, "Change in Racial Attitudes of White Southerners After Exposure to the Atmosphere of a Southern University," *Psychological Reports*, 25(1969) 555-558.

[138] Muir and McGlamery, pp. 111-112.

[139] *Ibid.*, p. 112. See, also, Ruth C. Shaffer and Albert Schaffer, "Socialization and the Development of Attitudes Toward Negroes in Alabama," *Phylon*, 27(1966) 274-285: and Donald E. Muir, "Six-Year Trends in Integration Attitudes of Deep-South University Students," *Integrated Education*, 9(January-February 1971), 21-27 and, same author, "The First Years of Desegregation: Patterns of Acceptance of Black Students on a Deep-South Campus, 1963-69," *Social Forces*, 49(March 1971) 371-378.

[140] Caffrey and others, p. 557.

[141] Gordon B. Forbes and Marilyn Gipson, "Political Attitudes and Opinions, Need for Social Approval. Dogmatism and Anxiety in Negro and White College Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter 1969, p. 63.

[142] Oliver Wendell Markley, *Having a Negro Roommate As An Experience in Intercultural Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968), p. 15. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1890).

[143] R.J. Hader, "Random Roommate Pairings of Negro and White Students," *American Statistician*, 21(1967) 26.

[144] James John Ross, *A Study of Racially Integrated Rooms in Men's Residence Halls at a State University* (Master's thesis, Illinois State Normal University, 1970).

[145] "Black and White at Northwestern University," *Integrated Education*, 6(1968)34.

[146] Paul Abrahams, "Black Thursday at Oshkosh," *Crisis*, 76(1969)373.

[147] See Jack Nelson and Jack Bass, *The Orangeburg Massacre* (N.Y.: World, 1970). For an account of an official Louisiana State inquiry; see *Chicago Sun Times* 11 July 1973.

[148] Nolen E. Bradley, Jr., *The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12,606).

[149] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

[150] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[151] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

[153] Gladyce H. Bradley, "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter 1964, p. 92.

[154] Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University*, p. 127.

[155] *Ibid.*, pp. 189-190.

[156] Calvin Trillin, *An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes* (New York: Viking, 1962), p. 58. See Hansjorg Elshorst, "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," *Phylon*, Spring 1967; the school is Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. See, also, Thomas Cato Tiller, Jr., *The Status of Racial Integration in Men's Social Fraternities at a Select Sample of Southeastern Universities* (Master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, n.d.).

[157] Charlayne Hunter, "A Homecoming for the First Black Girl at the University of Georgia," *New York Times Magazine*, January 25, 1970, p. 55.

[158] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[159] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[160] Annabel Liu, "The Problems Blacks Meet at Iowa State," *Des Moines Register*, May 5, 1974.

[161] Danny Wells, "Social Life Show for WVU Blacks," *Charleston Gazette*, June 1, 1974.

[162] W.H. Boone, "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," *Journal of Negro Education*, October 1942, p. 483. See, also, in the same issue the engaging article by Edythe Hargrave, "How I Feel as A Negro at a White College."

[163] Crain, *Southern Schools*, I, p. iv.

[164] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[165] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[166] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[167] *Ibid.*, II, iii.

[168] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[169] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[170] OCR, HEW, "Much Better Than They Expected," p. 47.

[171] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

[172] On this general phenomenon, see Warren David Ten Houten, *Socialization, Race and the American High School* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965), esp. p. 429. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-444).

[173] *NEA Task Force on School Desegregation in Louisiana* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, February 15-22, 1970), p. 17. See, also, Willie Morris, *Yazoo, Integration in a Deep South Town* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

[174] See Alabama Council on Human Relations and Others, *It's Not Over in the South. School Desegregation in 43 Southern Cities 18 Years After Brown* (N.Y.: NAACP Legal Defense Fund, May 1972).

[175] Quoted in Robert E. Anderson, Jr., *The South and Her Children: School Desegregation 1970-1971* (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Council, March, 1971), p. 82.

[176] Quoted in Betsy Fancher, *Voices from the South. Black Students Talk About Their Experiences in Desegregated Schools* (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Council, August 1970), p. 11.

[177] Robin Dorr, "Ordeal by Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, 10(July-August 1972), pp. 34-35.

[178] Lillian W. Clarke, "Race and Suspensions in New Orleans," *Integrated Education*, 11(May-June 1973), p. 32.

[179] John A. Bell, "Race and School Suspensions in Dallas," *Integrated Education*, 11(May-April 1973), p. 66.

[180] Mark A. Chesler and Phyllis Segal, *Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South* (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September 1967).

[181] *Ibid.*, p. 15.

[182] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[183] See *Integrated Education*, April-May 1966, p. 6.

[184] Chesler and Segal, p. 36.

[185] *Ibid.*, pp. 31 and 35.

[186] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[187] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[188] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[189] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

[190] Charles F. Morris, Jr., *Problems Encountered in the Desegregation of Carver Junior High School—1970-1971* (Master's thesis, Wake Forest University, 1971), p. 22.

[191] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[192] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[193] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

[194] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[195] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[196] Jane W. Woodward, *A Sociometric Study of Voluntary DeFacto Segregation in an Integrated School* (Master's research report, Wake Forest University, 1970), p. 10.

[197] Robert R. Mayer, Charles E. King, Anne Borders-Patterson, and James S. McCullough, *The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. A Case Study in the Analysis of Education Policy* (Lexington, Mass. Lexington Books, 1974), pp. 94, 99, 104.

[198] *Ibid.*, p. 73.

[199] *Evaluation of Desegregation 1970-71* (Miami, Fla.: Dade County Public Schools, June 1972), p. 95.

[200] Mary C. Williamson Hagar, *The Extent of Negro Student Involvement in an Integrated High School* (Master's thesis, Virginia State College, June 1969), p. 43.

[201] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[202] *Ibid.*, p. 61.

[203] Joyce H. Williams, *School Desegregation and Racial Fears in a Southern Community* (Master's thesis, Fort Valley State College, 1971), p. 45.

[204] *Ibid.*, p. 46.

[205] Charles L. Evans, *Short-Term Desegregation Effects: The Academic Achievement of Bused Students, 1971-72* (Fort Worth, Tex.: Fort Worth Independent School District, January 1973), p. 25.

[206] Lawrence G. Felice, "Busing in Waco, Texas," *Integrated Education*, 12(July-August 1974), p. 25.

[207] Bryant, *Some Effects of Racial Integration*, pp. 101-102.

[208] David E. Hunt and Robert H. Hardt, "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(1969)126.

[209] Ronald Alfred McWhirt, *The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration, and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967), p. 41. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,568).

[210] Bienvenu, *Effects of School Integration*, pp. 64, 67, and 73.

[211] Harootunian and Morse, *Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students*, p. 92.

[212] Edgar G. Epps, "Interpersonal Relations and Motivation: Implications for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Negro Education*, 39(1970) 15.

[213] Ronald Banks and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale, *A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration* (Buffalo, New York: Buffalo Public Schools, January 1969), pp. 8, 11, 19, and 21.

[214] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[215] Edward L. McDill, Mary S. McDill, and J. Timothy Sprehe, *Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education: An Appraisal of Evaluation Research* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970), pp. 43-44.

[216] Quoted in Donald S. Laing, *Other Aspects of Buffalo's Program of Quality Integrated Education* (Buffalo, N.Y.: Board of Education, February 21, 1971), pp. 2, 6, and 8.

[217] Ralph W. Barber, *The Effects of Open Enrollment on Anti-Negro and Anti-White Prejudices Among Junior High School Students in Rochester, New York* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968), p. 102.

[218] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[219] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[220] Charles V. Willie with Jerome Beker, *Race Mixing in the Public Schools* (New York: Praeger, 1973), p. 3.

[221] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[222] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[223] Marguerite Cusack Moreno, *The Effect of Integration on the Aptitude, Achievement, Attitudes to School and Class and Social Acceptance of Negro and White Pupils in a Small Urban School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1971), p. 62.

[224] In Schlesinger and Michael D'Amore, *Children in the Balance* (New York: Citation Press, 1971), p. 29.

[225] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[226] *Ibid.*, p. 56 (emphasis in original).

[227] Harold B. Gerard, Terrence D. Jackson, and Edward J. Conolley, *Social Contact in the Desegregated Classroom*, p. 11 (unpublished).

[228] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[229] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

[230] Leonard A. Marascuilo and F. Dagenais, *Identification of Social Groups Based on Social Integration in a Multi-Racial High School*, 1974, p. 2 (unpublished).

[231] Leonard A. Marascuilo, *Follow-Up Study of Student Attitude Toward School Reorganization of the Public Schools of a Northern City*, January 1972, p. 60 (ERIC ED 069 843).

[232] Leonard A. Marascuilo and Joel R. Levin, "Inter- and Intra-racial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February 1966, annual meeting of the American Education Research Association.

[233] *Ibid.*, pp. 6 and 9.

[234] Darshan Sachdeva, "A Measurement of Changes in Interracial Student Attitudes in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research*, 66(May-June 1973), p. 422.

[235] Darshan Sachdeva, "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research*, 23(1972), p. 51.

[236] Division Of Educational Research, *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration 1971-72* (San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972), pp. 268-269.

[237] *Ibid.*, p. 271.

[238] Basic data taken from tabular matter in *ibid.*

[239] Data in Lurlene Bush, *Final Evaluation Report, Emergency School Aid Act, School Year 1973-74, Section VII: ESAA Counseling Program (Need #2)* (San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, July 1974), p. VII-7.

[240] James E. Teele, *Evaluating School Busing. Case Study of Boston's Operation Exodus* (New York: Praeger, 1973), pp. 76-77.

[241] Bert Meltzer, *The Influence of the Duration of Interracial Classroom Contact on the Development of Interpersonal Cognitive Skills* (Doctoral dissertation, Clark University, 1969), p. 133.

[242] Elizabeth Livingston Useem, *White Suburban Secondary Students in Schools with Token Desegregation: Correlates of Racial Attitudes* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1971), p. 130.

[243] Elizabeth Livingston Useem, "White Students and Token Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, 10(September-October 1972), p. 52.

[244] Wood, *The Effects of Busing*, p. 45.

[245] Moorefield, *The Busing of Minority Group Children*, p. 78.

[246] *Ibid.*, p. 157.

[247] *Ibid.*, p. 167.

[248] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

[249] William D. Coats, James W. Booth, and David E. Bartz, *A Longitudinal Study of Desegregation in Kalamazoo, Michigan*, September 7, 1972, p. 17. Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.

[250] William Stanley Nowak, *The Effect of School Busing on Black Student Attitude Toward School* (Master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1970), p. 53.

[251] See Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr., Charles A. Glatt, and William A. Gaines, "Student Relationships and Activities in Desegregated Schools," *High School Journal*, 54(1970-1971) pp. 188-201.

CHAPTER 9
TEACHERS AND THEIR STUDENTS

"We could wish no child a happier fate," declares the British Plowden Report, "than to encounter ' "a good teacher."[1] One might add: and a good school board, superintendent, and principal, as well as a supportive community. Together, they constitute the human resources that bear most significantly on the quality of the child's educational experience in the school and classroom. Yet, researchers have virtually ignored some while stressing others. Almost untouched is the possible role of racial and ethnic factors in the school and classroom context. These factors are the central concern in this chapter.

SCHOOL BOARD INFLUENCES

Historical and legal evidence demonstrates the pervasive opposition of school boards to desegregation, both in the North and South. Only in the face of binding Federal court orders has substantial desegregation proceeded. Voluntary removal of racial separation remains rare. In numerous instances, lower court decisions were appealed as a matter of form so that many cases languished in the courts for up to decades. Delay and evasion resulted in the perpetuation of segregation long after the *Brown* decision of 1954.

In the South – especially the rural areas – school boards affected teacher-student interaction after desegregation by systematically discharging or demoting black principals and teachers. In numerous cases, black teachers were assigned to segregated classrooms in presumably desegregated schools. As a National Education Association (NEA) task force sent to Louisiana reported in 1970: "Many transferred black teachers . . . have not had problems of any kind in dealing with white schools, because they deal with no white students."[2] In Alabama, during 1966-1970, the number of black principals fell by 56 percent.[3] During the longer period, 1954-1968, Baxter found in Arkansas that black male teachers were disproportionately displaced despite the fact that they were relatively young and experienced. About 70 percent of black teachers displaced in desegregated districts were assigned to other, all-black schools.[4] Claye, in studying the assignment of 233 teachers in Deep South elementary schools, found that "those in authority tend to assign the inexperienced and senile white teachers to formerly all-Negro schools and experienced productive Negro teachers to formerly all-white schools."[5]

In a study of 81 school districts in the North, Zeigler and Boss examined the racial policies of school board members and superintendents. Modal black enrollment ranged around 15 percent. The researchers found a general vagueness and ambiguity characterizing the responses. "Perhaps the best indicator of the ambiguity in school policy regarding racial problems, wrote Zeigler and Boss, "is the evidence of clear contradictions among the school board members and the superintendent in any given district over what action the school district had taken . . . arising in over three-quarters of the cases."[6] A small scale example of a related subject was the refusal of a school board near Vancouver, British Columbia to employ teachers with special cultural knowledge to teach Indian children in an off-reservation school. Hawkes reports:

> Teachers with this type of training were not appointed to the school because the school board did not see the school as requiring staff with such qualifications. This policy had been established, in part, on the advice of the principals of the schools in the district in which there were Indian children registered.[7]

It may be supposed that numerous school boards reflect the same essentially ethnocentric reasoning.

THE SUPERINTENDENTS

With the advent of the desegregation movement, superintendents in the South joined school boards in seeking delays where possible. Board policies of discriminatory discharge or reassignment of black teachers and principals were readily implemented. As civil rights pressure rose, concessions were grudgingly made. Allen, in studying the impact of desegregation on the employment of black principals in North Carolina, reported that "the attitude of most superintendents as revealed in their responses while being interviewed bordered on following the law concerning desegregation but avoiding any effort to encourage the process."[8]

Zeigler and Boss found an essentially similar situation in northern school districts. Superintendents in those areas had "a fundamental insensitivity to racial problems in the schools."[9] They tended even more than school board members to regard integration as a problem brought on only by external forces such as the Federal Government. In the absence of local civil rights protest activity, the probability of action against racial problems was minimal. "In only one school district," according to Zeigler and Boss, "did school governors indicate that any action was taken in an attempt to minimize racial problems before such problems became critical."[10] In one northern city of 30,000, court testimony highlighted ongoing racial practices which had been denied repeatedly. Jones and associates wrote:

> From court testimony by school personnel and subpoenaed school records, it is clear that race was involved in the [student] track assignments. As a matter of court evidence, while the school district's top administration denied awareness that race was even involved, the school records and the testimony of the person in charge of placement indicated that students were identified by race on placement schedules, which is, of course, illegal.[11]

In numerous other Federal court cases, similar contradictions were uncovered.

BLACK ADMINISTRATORS

Before 1966, the presence of a black person in a top central administrative positive was unthinkable in the South and unheard of in the North. Moody, himself a former black superintendent, reported that before 1966, a black aspirant could only hope to become assistant superintendent in charge of special projects, director of human relations, or administrative assistant for minority affairs.[12] In the 5 years following 1966, however, 17 black persons became chief school administrators; another four districts were headed by blacks serving in a temporary capacity. These were, however, "dying districts with built-in failure components."[13] They were afflicted with very severe financial problems compounded by the low-income character of district inhabitants. In the words of Frelow, another black administrator, "hiring a black superintendent is viewed as a psychological acknowledgment that the district is 'going black'."[14] Since the racial composition of these districts was heavily black, there was little opportunity for black superintendents to affect student racial interaction. How they affected teacher-student interaction is unknown. Moody does report that when he was appointed superintendent in Harvey, Ill., in 1968, "grievances and lawsuits were filed by the teachers' union, principals, and citizen groups declaring that he was unqualified."[15]

OTHER ADMINISTRATORS

Black persons were frequently employed as central office and school level administrators when a white superintendent strongly attached to equal opportunity held the top office. In Evanston, Ill., the tenure of Dr. Gregory C. Coffin as superintendenta was marked by a significant increase in the number of black administrators:[16]

Race of administrator	1967-8	1968-9	1969-70	1970-1
Black	7	8	11	13
White	48	38	29	26
Percent black	12.7	17.4	27.5	33.3

In Berkeley, Calif., a growing commitment of the school board to an equal opportunity program led during the 1960's to an important increase of minorities in the administrative corps.[17] Both in Philadelphia and San Francisco, superintendents attempted to increase the number of minority administrators. Dr. Mark Shedd succeeded to a considerable degree in Philadelphia. Dr. Thomas Shaheen at San Francisco made little headway as existing administrators summoned up the unique protection of a tenure law to prevent appointment of minority administrators.

Stones studied racial attitudes of principals in 66 Texas schools located in Dallas, Houston, and San Antonio. (142 principals were contacted; the number of responses were quite low. If, however, the results reflected mainly the views of less prejudiced principals, this is of some empirical if not scientific interest.) Stones, then an undergraduate at the University of Texas, found that many of the principals were isolated from the really large black communities. About a third

> . . . thought most blacks are less ambitious and that most black families are not stable and law abiding. Thirty percent . . . thought stereotyping black children as lacking ambition causes no harm. . .[18]

Unfortunately, no on site visits were made to enable Stones to ascertain the educational significance of his findings.

Under conditions of desegregation, the presence of principals who are sympathetic to the changeover has been found to be of considerable importance. As noted in the preceding chapter, Willie reported the significance of this factor in a study of Syracuse, N.Y. In Shelby County, Tenn., Olds analyzed teacher reactions to faculty desegregation. "The principal," he wrote, "was the single most important factor contributing to a positive commitment toward faculty desegregation."[19] The NORC study of many southern school districts in 1971-72 found that desegregated schools with black principals stood a greater chance of creating a favorable school climate for desegregation.[20] Crain comments on the irony of this finding alongside the widespread discharge and demotion of black principals in districts undergoing desegregation.

School boards and superintendents play crucial roles in setting the limits of racial policy in school systems. As previously noted, their influence has been restrictive and not receptive to desegregation. This negativism may have served to discourage organized efforts in the schools aimed at facilitating racial change. When, however, legal imperatives become unavoidable, it is equally clear that some formerly resistant districts changed their orientation toward racial change in the schools. This seemed to have been the case in Charlotte, N.C. As a group, principals seem little disposed to challenge official school system policies when these are tilted against desegregation. Once the direction of policies is changed, the principal may make an important contribution by exercising educational leadership in the school.[21]

THE TEACHERS

TEACHER ATTITUDES

Wilcox has suggested that the ghetto system of school and community life creates the groundwork for not educating the children of the ghetto: ". . . Teachers can legitimately fail to teach and students can legitimately fail to learn. The nonachievement of the students has no bearing on the professional fortunes of the teachers: the nonachivement of the students is viewed as a mere fulfillment of the self-fulfillment prophecy."[22] A more recent declaration has made a similar point: "By and large, the [school] system has expected the [inner city] student to be a failure, and unaware of its failure, has succeeded in creating the student in its own image."[23]

In the District of Columbia public schools, Silver sought to understand why 80 percent of the elementary teachers – most of them black – expressed satisfaction with their jobs and students while faced with widespread scholastic failure among their students, most of whom were black, too. Silver found that these teachers developed an adaptive subculture which served as a defense against feelings of professional failure. The main spirit of the subculture is one of insulation of teachers from students. Peer relations among teachers are directed not toward professional considerations so much as toward the attainment of power and authority in school affairs. Teachers who work in the poorest school are, according to Silver, most attached to the existing organizational structure of the school. Mere maintenance of discipline became one of the strongest common binding forces among teachers. Another frequent theme in such schools is the issue of academic standards. Silver wrote that "agreeing that high academic standards are maintained makes it possible for teachers to displace responsibility for students' inability to learn to the students themselves."[24] She regarded such beliefs as "collective rationalization" by teachers. The lower the class composition of the school, according to Silver, the higher are the barriers separating student from teacher; and the more powerful a hold do peer relations exercise on teachers.

Silver has offered an interpretation, rather than a documentation, of academic failure among children in segregated circumstances. The greatest merit of her approach is the emphasis upon group definitions instead of individual attitudes. To the social psychologist, this makes sense. It is also consistent with conclusions stated in chapters 4 and 5. On the other hand, the interpretation is somewhat schematic and removed from everyday school realities. A full-scale historical and contemporary study of the District of Columbia schools is needed in order to fully test Silver's approach. It should be noted that in this approach race is not fundamental; Silver happened to select one city which is heavily black. Her view is meant to apply to urban school systems of varying ethnic composition.

It will be recalled from Ogbu's study of "Burgherside" (see chapter 5) that teachers identified not with the poor and minority children but with the dominant white community. Failure of the children to learn is attributed by teachers to the presumed "cultural deprivation" or "cultural disadvantagement" of the children. On the basis of intensive contacts with teachers and children, Ogbu declared:

> Teachers construct "models" of what children are like, "models" based for the most part on income level, education, percentage of children on public assistance, and ethnic composition, the "independent variables" that influence children's achievement in school. They check their models not against real life in Burgherside, but against reports of public agencies and against similar models constructed in other school districts, and inventories of assumed characteristics of "deprived children" or "disadvantaged children" provided by social scientists.[25]

Little concern or expectation was shown by teachers for an improvement in general levels of achievement.

Harris' study of Negro and white children in 18 substantially segregated schools found that teachers of the two racial groups had different standards of grading. Teachers of the white children tended to base grades on actual achievement; teachers of the Negro children used some other, undetermined base.[26] North and Buchanan investigated teacher attitudes toward poverty area children in Phoenix, Ariz. In general, teachers approached the children in terms of a negativistic stereotype.[27] This was somewhat less true of Negro teachers than of white teachers. In the Pittsburgh metropolitan area, Elliott studied 400 teachers in the junior and senior high schools. He found that "teachers who are racially and ethnically prejudiced tend to have negative attitudes toward the poverty group . . . [of students]."[28] He also found that the socioeconomic origin of the teachers gave no reliable clue to their orientation toward poverty students. Elliott refers to "patterned discriminatory poverty attitudes on the part of teachers."[29] Hawkes and Furst tested a widespread stereotype among teachers. The teachers believed, wrongly, that black students from poor families did not worry about school achievement whereas white middle class students did. Hawkes and Furst report the black children worried more than the white children.[30]

Corwin and Schmidt probed teacher attitudes in the schools of Columbus, Ohio. Teachers in schools attended by poor and black children were more than twice as likely to report poor student motivation than those who taught in middle class schools. The researchers speculated on whether this diagnosis itself helped create a self-fulfilling prophecy of student failure. They wrote:

> At least one of the conditions necessary for the operation of the self-fulfilling prophecy appears to exist, at least in limited form, in inner-city schools, namely, a lack of faith and optimism in the motivation and abilities of pupils, and a tendency to disclaim responsibility for the educational problems that exist . . . The fact that nearly one-third of the teachers in the inner-city schools discount the ability of their students is not an insignificant proportion, and whether true or not, it is perhaps a large enough number to generate the self-fulfilling cycle.[31]

Since this was a questionnaire study, there was no opportunity for the investigators to enter classrooms and observe whether these attitudes were in fact translated into practice.

Teacher attitudes in San Francisco schools were studied by Spellman and associates in 1967, 4 years before implementation of court-ordered desegregation in that city. Only experienced full-time teachers were included. Individual teachers completed questionnaires while group interviews were held with sizable numbers of regular teachers, compensatory teachers, and principals. Some 83 percent of the teachers in predominantly Asian schools preferred their present assignment while only 23 percent of those at black junior high schools wanted to remain.[32]

In a city of western New York State, 100 teachers were queried as to rank-order of seriousness of behavior problems among minority and all school boys. Following is a compilation of the highest 10 items for minority boys as compared with ratings on the same items for any boys:[33]

Behavior problems	Minority group boys	Any boys
Truancy	1	5
Profanity	2	35.5
Resentful	3	12
Easily discouraged	4	10
Lack of interest in work	5	14
Stealing	6	1
Inattention	7.5	20
Tardiness	7.5	38
Smoking	9.5	35.5
Suspiciousness	9.5	16

A fair interpretation of these data might suggest that these teachers see minority boys as less teachable because of behavior defects rather than intellectual shortcomings.

Two studies of desegregation in Bibb County, Ga., have been made. Smith found that with reference to two schools, 13 out of 19 white teachers thought desegregation had come too fast; none of the 12 black teachers agreed.[34] Wynn studied 41 white and 26 black teachers in urban schools of the county. Half the white teachers reported communication difficulties with black students; none of the black teachers reported such problems with white students. A third of the white teachers preferred teaching only white students; no black teachers shared this preference. While nearly three-quarters of the black teachers preferred teaching mixed classes, only a little more than a quarter of the white teachers so preferred.[35]

Corwin studied the attitudes of Teacher Corps interns who taught poor and minority students. Since they were predominantly upper-middle class whites, one might expect that they would have stressed cognitive learning. In fact, Corwin reports, the reverse was the case:

> . . . The interns who were the most self-consciously personable, warm, and compassionate in their relationships with students also appeared to be the most hostile to scholarship; they . . . discounted the importance of cognitive achievement in their own pupils . . . The interns were discounting the importance of cognitive achievement for precisely the groups of youngsters who most needed to improve their academic skills.[36]

On the other hand, when asked to explain the low academic achievement of their students, 7 out of 10 interns selected as their first or second choice the factor of "poor home background." This was only slightly lower than the choice of the same factor by regular teachers in the same school. There seemed to be a complete unreadiness to acknowledge the possible role of the teacher and the school.

Long and Henderson conducted an experiment among 120 white teachers attending a summer course. A description of children was read aloud, in which clear racial and class cues were given. Participants were then asked to predict how many of the children would be reading on grade level when they entered the grade. Race played no part in the answers. Neither did social class nor teacher backgroud. Yet, certain possibly significant findings emerged. For example, "southern teachers . . . rated passive blacks higher than passive whites, but active blacks lower than active whites."[37] This might well have reflected a white cultural preference for black compliance and the imposition of a penalty on black behavior that violated the custom.

The dozen or so studies reviewed in this section strongly suggest the widespread existence of teacher avoidance behavior as far as minority children are concerned. These students tend to be viewed by their teachers as less promising and more troublesome. The significant unknown element, however, is how these teachers behave in actual classrooms. An expressed attitude is one thing; daily practice may be quite another matter.

EMPIRICAL INTERRACIAL STUDIES

Parsons studied the two worlds of the Mexican American and the Anglo in a small town of 1,800 population located 150 miles south of San Francisco.[38] Mexican Americans made up 55 percent of the residents of "Guadalupe."[39]

The family is the dominant relationship in the life of the Mexican American child. Paramount are the obligations between parents and children and between brothers and sisters. Children are strictly supervised until they are 12 or 13; largely for this reason Mexican American children attend few school functions. Many of these cultural facts of life are unknown to Anglo teachers. As Parsons reported: "What some teachers have pointed out to the researcher as 'cliques' turned out to be groups of brothers and sisters and cousins who play and eat together because this is what is expected of them by each other and by their parents."[40] What is family solidarity to some appears as ethnic cleavage to the outside observer.

But that ethnic cleavage is all but complete in Guadalupe. Except for one teacher in the town, "not a single Anglo had ever been inside a Mexican home."[41] In every aspect of the town's life – making a living, going to church, recreation, and more – the Mexican American feels his separateness and his subordination. The Mexican American accepts the subordinate role completely.

The school is a typical Guadalupe institution. While Mexican Americans make up only 57 percent of enrollment, the principal and teachers – all Anglo – overestimate the percentage. Most teachers are convinced Mexican American children are less intelligent thaan Anglo children. Parsons checked IQ scores for both groups and found the following distribution of mean scores:[42]

Grade	Anglo	Mexican American
3	97	91
4	110	92
5	111	104
6	111	99
7	104	97
8	97	95

Ability grouping is practiced to an extreme degree with the high ability classes being almost entirely Anglo. A teacher explained to Parsons that such classes are kept as "small as possible because we feel that the brighter pupils deserve a chance to get as much as they can out of school without being held back by the kids who are dull or just lazy or don't care."[43]

Parsons sat in on numerous classes and compiled an extensive log of teacher practices that illustrated the everyday reality of ethnic cleavage. Anglo "helpers" aided the teachers; no Mexican American children were ever so designated. Frequently and systematically, teachers ignored Mexican American children's hands in favor of calling on Anglos. Often, while Mexican American children were reciting, teachers interrupted them to listen to an Anglo child. Teachers related very informally with Anglo children, inquiring about family affairs and the like; with Mexican American children they were strict. Teachers went out of their way to praise and encourage Anglo children while just as regularly criticizing Mexican American children. Frequently, teachers explained to Parsons that preferential treatment for Anglo children was necessary because they were going to grow up to lead Guadalupe and they might as well get used to it early.[44]

Parsons administered sociometric tests in February 1965. Anglos expressed stronger self-preferences than did the Mexican Americans. Anglos looked toward other Anglos for prestige while Mexican American children looked to both groups. Mexican Americans, however, were more interested in Anglo prestige than Anglo companionship.[45] In various ways the relative self-depreciation of Mexican Americans can be seen:

> The Mexican pupils . . . considered themselves to be about as attractive as the Anglo pupils. When choosing persons who are thought to be unattractive, however, the Mexicans tended to choose in their own group more than among Anglos . . . 94 percent of the Anglos and 80 percent of the Mexicans chose Anglos as being "smart," and ' . . 88 percent of the Anglos and 70 percent of the Mexicans chose Mexicans as being dumb . . . Anglo pupils generally consider the Mexican pupils to be lazy and not to care, a consideration which, interestingly enough, is reflected in the choices made by the Mexican pupils themselves. Acceptance of social subordination is clear throughout.[46]

The school of Guadalupe, then, reflects strongly the value given to Anglos there. Parsons broadens his portrait: "Where, as in the case of Southwestern communities like Guadalupe, the social structure exhibits caste-like features based on ethnic differentiation, the school as one of the 'most vital of all institutions," will be operated by and in the interests of the dominant group."[47] Parsons' study is outstanding for its realism, its intimate knowledge of the most ordinary details of everyday life, and for its clear concept of power in relation to education.

Nearly a decade after Parsons' study a new survey was completed under auspices of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Its coverage was extraordinary. Five observers visited 429 classrooms in 52 schools located in California, Texas, and New Mexico. Focus of the study was the differences, if any, between teacher interaction with Mexican American and Anglo students. Since school districts then under Federal inquiry for possible discrimination were excluded from the commission study, disparities in teacher treatment were underestimated.

The principal findings of the study were reported as follows:

> . . . Teachers praise or encourage Anglo children 36 percent more often than Mexican Americans. They use or build upon the contributions of Anglo pupils fully 40 percent more frequently than those of Chicano pupils. Combining all types of approving or accepting teacher behavior, the teachers respond positively to Anglos about 40 percent more than they do to Chicano students. Teachers also direct questions to Anglo students 21 percent more often than they direct them to Mexican American. In addition, Mexican American pupils receive significantly less overall attention from the teacher, measured by the extent to which teachers address their students in a noncritical way. In light of these findings, it is not surprising to have also found that Mexican American children participate less in class than do Anglos; they speak less frequently both in response to the teacher and on their own initiative. The total picture that emerges from this study of classroom interaction is one in which Mexican American students are ignored compared to their Anglo counterparts.[48]

In part, concluded the chief researchers, low academic achievement of many Chicano students is attributed to the classroom behavior of teachers in the Southwest.[49] While Parsons did not discuss this specific issue in his research, the data in his study would most likely support this conclusion.

During the mid 1930's in Chicago, Beckham studied, among other attitudes, white teacher prejudice against Negro students. Interviewing 250 nondelinquent high school boys, 100 delinquent boys, and 100 adults, he asked whether they personally had found white teachers prejudiced against Negroes. They responded as follows, by percentage.[50]

Relative numbers of white teachers prejudicial against Negroes	Nondelinquents (percent)	Delinquents (percent)	Adults (percent)
Many	9.5	27.2	40
Few	42.8	4.5	40
None	44.4	68.1	20
	96.7	99.8	100

In Chapel Hill, N.C., Ellis and Wiggins found that teachers of Negro children in a biracial classroom were reported by the children as tending to ignore their good achievement.[51] Both teachers and parents tended to expect lower achievement than actually occurred.[52]

Rosenhan conducted an experiment with 72 first graders in Trenton, N.J.; 24 were middle class whites and 48 were lower class Negroes and whites. He hypothesized: "If lower class children are more alienated in a middle class institution, they should be more responsive to praise than middle class children would be. By the same token, the performance of lower class children should be more disrupted by disapproval than that of their middle class peers."[53] The hypothesis was supported. Lower class learning was heavily influenced by praise or disapproval. Class was found to be far more important than race.

In a desegregated junior high school in Virginia, Datta found that teachers regarded low-achieving Negro students as hostile outsiders while high-achieving Negro children were described as favorably as high-scoring white children. Datta called for programs "to develop teacher understanding and acceptance of groups of pupils who now are likely to experience rejection in the classroom."[54]

Amos studied ninth graders in three integrated schools in Flint, Mich. Both Negro and white students felt rejected by their teachers although the white students thought their Negro classmates were being accepted.[55] Amos reported a difference between the expressed attitudes of the teachers toward Negro students and the way the Negro students perceived their teachers' behavior.

In virtually none of these studies is there any indication that special teaching or curriculum adaptations were made. When Baltimore's schools underwent their initial desegregation in 1955, for example, the school administration held that "special 'preparation' of teachers for integrated schools was unnecessary, and would probably do more harm than good by calling attention to differences when teachers should think of likenesses."[56] Such a view was wholly consistent with common sense and, since virtually no large-scale desegregation projects had occurred anywhere to show otherwise, very possibly correct. Since then, however, a good deal of experience has been accumulated. Repeated studies have shown the importance of deliberate classroom changes that are required for effective desegregation.

If, as was documented in chapter 6, more learning occurs in desegregated than segregated schools and classrooms, then why are any further preparations needed? In the same Baltimore report just quoted, the following statement appears: "There can be no doubt that many [teachers] in their hearts prefer segregation and regret the new policy of interracial schools."[57] This is a prime reason for taking special measures as part of a desegregation program. As Chesler put it, we cannot depend on "doing what comes naturally". He continued, "too much of what is natural in American race relations is distrustful and separatist: desegregation itself is a departure from our natural social patterns, and other breaks with tradition are vital."[58]

Yet, Blake cautions against assuming that desegregation increases the number of disadvantaged children and thus occasions the training of teachers to deal with this additional disadvantage.[59] He stated:

> When schools are desegregated, there is not an increase in the number of disadvantaged children. They may [now] be distributed in different schools but that does not automatically mean that the teachers in these schools are ill-equipped to teach them.[60]

Blake urged that different kinds of measures need to be taken to improve "education in biracial settings."[61] If teachers in a desegregated school are not competent to teach, both Blake and Chesler say, they should be trained further. Blake wrote: "Only teachers in a desegregated school who are incompetent to teach the disadvantaged need the additional training."[62] According to Chesler, "the teacher who is a skilled and fully competent professional has a good start on being successful in an interracial situation."[63]

Gottlieb studied inner-city Negro and white teachers' views of their students.[64] All teachers were given a checklist with a number of character traits of students and were asked to check those that applied to the students (all of whom were Negro). White teachers tended to see the Negro child as highstrung, impetuous, lazy, moody, rebellious, and talkative. Negro teachers, on the other hand, viewed students as ambitious, cooperative, energetic, funloving, and happy. These characterizations are based on the items in the following table.[65]

Traits	Teachers' race and perceptions of students White (percent)	 Negro (percent)
Ambitious	20	36
Cooperative	35	61
Energetic	33	48
Funloving	45	74
Happy	31	65
Highstrung	39	3
Impetuous	33	13
Lazy	53	19
Middle brow	4	19
Moody	33	13
Rebellious	35	13
Talkative	59	6

There is a 15 percent or greater difference between Negro and white teachers. Clearly, the two groups of teachers differ greatly in orientation toward their students. A great disparity in orientation is also evident in this tabulation.[66]

Teachers' race and reasons for job dissatisfaction

Reasons	White total responses percent	Negro total responses percent
Inadequate materials and poor facilities	6	33
Crowed classrooms	13	38
Lack of parental interest	25	6
Behavior-discipline problems	46	19
Others	10	4
	100	100

The Negro teacher sees the major obstacles in the physical supplies and facilities, whereas the white teachers stress shortcomings in the students and their parents. White teachers tended to be pessimistic about the educational future of the children. But, held Gottlieb, "the Negro teachers are less pessimistic in the evaluations of students since many of the teachers themselves have come from backgrounds similar to that of their students yet managed to overcome social barriers and attain positions of responsibility and status."[67] A question could be raised as to the applicability of these findings to the desegregated school. White teachers who carried their attitudes into the desegregated school would create a special handicap for Negro children. On the other hand, the presence of Negro teachers would be important.

More than 250 entering freshmen in virtually an all-black North Carolina Central University at Durham were studied by Nelsen and Uhl. Their responses were divided into two categories according to whether they had graduated from a segregated or desegregated high school. Since the study was made in 1970, probably a number of the freshmen had attended schools thoroughly desegregated by court order. The researchers sought to understand teacher-student interaction *through the students' eyes.* They did not go to the site to check these impressions. Student judgments were expressed in discrepancy scores; that is, they stated their choice of "what should be" and then "what is." The difference is the discrepancy.

A majority of students who had graduated from desegregated schools interpreted their experience positively. Yet, negative as well as positive elements were recalled. Higher discrepancy scores – that is, more negative scores – were recorded from desegregated than for segregated schools on several important dimensions:

> . . . Students from desegregated schools indicated that they felt less loyalty toward their schools; that teachers gave too many failing grades, and, to a moderate degree, that teachers did not care enough about the individual student; that some teachers paid most attention to students who planned to go on to college; and that the students did not get along very well with one another.[68]

Discrepancy scores were smaller in desegregated than segregated schools on other dimensions:

> Students from desegregated schools [felt]. . . that their school buildings were well taken care of, that the schools had lots of clubs and extracurricular activities; that the schools offered adequate vocational courses such as home economics, agriculture and industrial arts; and that most of the students attending the schools would go on to college.[69]

This contrast was not exhaustive.

In the desegregated schools, both black and white teachers were frequently reported as favoring white students, even in discipline matters. This gave rise to feelings of discrimination on the part of black students. The degree to which teachers seemed to care about students, on the other hand, did not differ significantly as between segregated and desegregated schools. While students in desegregated schools reported a greater stress on competition for grades, they also tended to agree that such competition was good. Perhaps closely linked to this was a further impression that black students in desegregated schools more readily identified their peers as likely to go on to college. Nelsen and Uhl acknowledge the overall positive character of experience in desegregated schools.

They stress, however, the presence of negative elements. In total, these elements seem to be quite within the power of schools to change should they so desire.

Zamoff studied teacher attitudes toward desegregation in an upstate city of New York State. Of the 123 teachers interviewed, nine were black. In general, teachers avoided discussing segregation and desegregation. They also tended to avoid consideration of the possible role of the school in producing low academic achievement among black students. Zamoff found the teachers to be poorly informed on desegregation. Desegregated schools in the city were more likely to show high incidence of dissatisfied teachers. At the same time, the dissatisfaction did not appear to be directed meaningfully into effecting educational change as a change in the racial character of the student body took place.

In a white middle class neighborhood of New York City, Brooks analyzed the fortunes of 95 black children participating in the Open Enrollment (OE) program. They were bused daily. Of a total 1,100 enrollment the bused children constituted less than 10 percent. Resident whites and many teachers were deeply antagonistic to the program. The former feared a deleterious effect on the children in school achievement. After a year of the program, the school average reading score actually increased; but the fears persisted.[70]

Because the OE program children as a group were lower achievers than children in the receiving school, they would ordinarily have been placed in lower reading ability groups. Such assignments would have resulted in predominantly black classrooms. To avoid this outcome, a number of OE children were placed in higher ability groups than their formal scores would dictate. Brooks reported that teachers resented the consequent placement of resident white students in lower ability groups. During the year, the percentage of OE students who read below grade level, declined from 58 to 46. Teachers did not attribute this progress to the desegregation program. Instead they held that it was "the academically able students [who] showed the greatest gains but they felt that these students would have improved even in the sending schools while those who were academically less able did not show any worthwhile improvement."[71]

When Brooks examined achievement test scores of 84 OE children, she found that teachers, in general, understimated them. Here is a listing of placement of OE students in reading achievement as indicated by standardized test scores and by teachers' estimates:[72]

Number of students:

	By test scores	By teachers' estimates
On grade level	28	30
Above grade level	26	16
Below grade level	30	38

During a series of interviews with nine teachers and the principal, they felt – in Brooks' phrase – that the OE children "present special problems academically." While this was undoubtedly true in terms of the receiving school's experience, yet it missed the larger positive significance of the OE students who were learning more than previously.

Brooks interviewed about one-fifth (20) of the OE total. In view of the generally negative responses of teachers to the program, one might expect a similar orientation of students to the school. The very opposite proved to be the case. The children were highly positive about the receiving school. They were convinced that they were achieving more academically than they had in their sending school. One said: "Most of the time in the other school we do easy phonics, easy math, easy everything." Another: "In this school, the teachers know more." And still another: "We didn't do no work there."[73] Children stated they were happier at the receiving school and pointed to their teachers as the major factor influencing the positive attitude.

What lay behind this anomalous situation? Too often, it is facilely assumed that a teacher's negative attitudes are automatically converted into deprecatory messages to his or her students. It is unlikely that the "message" received was the same as the one sent. More likely are two complementary explanations. First, teachers may have related to the OE children as individual learners while in the classroom but resorted to socially acceptable negative expressions while in the company of colleagues. A second possibility is that some teachers are more "professional" than others and thus find it ultimately more satisfying to regard each child as an individual learner. Perhaps most likely is the situation where both alternatives are true of a given teacher at one time.

Central administrative efforts to ensure a successful desegregation program were minimal. The city board of education, according to Brooks, did little at all.

> . . . There was no evidence that any organized plan of in-service education was actually carried out for personnel in the receiving school prior to launching the program . . . Citywide planning was poorly co-ordinated and insufficient funds were allocated to provide all the necessary services, and materials that were needed to insure the effective functioning of the program.[74]

Much of the success of the program at the school was evidently left to teachers' initiative.

Israel studied differences between effective and ineffective teachers in 35 elementary schools in Brooklyn, N.Y. The most and least effective teachers were designated by the principal in each school; the basis of the choice was not described. Attitudes of 167 teachers were based on responses to a questionnaire distributed by the researcher. Highly effective teachers believed that low aspirations were an important part of the problem of low achievement. They saw little reason to believe that educational aspiration of poor and minority students would benefit from attendance in an integrated school situation, even if white middle class children also attended. Least effective teachers were twice as likely to want to leave the lower class schools being studied. Unfortunately, it is not possible to explore possible interrelationships between student achievement and teacher expectations.

The pitfalls of depending on teacher impressions of their students' achievement are highlighted in a study by Thompson and Dyke in Rochester, N.Y. In an urban-suburban voluntary desegregation program, teachers reported all but 4 of 35 bused students had increased their rate of reading to that of the average for the school. Thompson and Dyke examined test results for 24 students; 13 showed only a growth rate of 6 months during the year. Indeed, 4 of the 13 students registered an actual decrease in achievement.[75]

Another problem in studies of teacher interaction with students emerged in an inquiry by Byalick who analyzed the classroom behavior of 60 female elementary teachers in rural Georgia and South Carolina. He wanted to learn about differences in the teaching style of black and white teachers with respect to positive reinforcement (i.e., actions designed to encourage students). He found a considerable divergence between the teachers' theory and practice. Classroom observers reported to Byalick that most teachers did not use the techniques of reinforcement for which they had stated a preference.[76] (Research studies based exclusively on teachers' expressed preferences may fit only an imaginary classroom.)

Aside from this issue, Byalick reported a number of other important findings. Male students of the opposite race were reinforced most frequently; black female students received the least reinforcement from teachers. This finding may be especially significant in the light of numerous studies which have found that black female students usually fare worse in desegregated schools than do black males. Usually, this effect is attributed to factors other than teacher behavior. Byalick also found that white teachers tended to restrict reinforcement-by-touching to children of their own race.

Most striking is his conclusion that the educational environment of the classroom is not necessarily augmented by positive reinforcement. Much of the reinforcement was found to be rather perfunctory:

> Both observers . . . noticed that although some teachers emit many behaviors that are positively reinforcing to children, these behaviors seem to be mechanical and are often followed up with negative comments directed toward other children . . . Several teachers reinforced children without displaying any positive emotion or positive facial attention . . . The majority of the teachers observed reinforced children without moving from behind their desks.[77]

The researcher did not report whether perfunctory or passive reinforcement practices varied among teachers by race.

In 1972, Jensen and Rosenfeld investigated the role of ethnicity, social class, and mode of classroom presentation on teachers' interaction with students in Austin, Tex. Subjects were 156 teachers in 12 junior high schools and 4 senior highs. No actual classrooms were used; instead, the teachers viewed videotapes of fifth and sixth graders. Teachers preferred Anglo, black, and Mexican American students in that order. Less teacher discrimination against minority children occurred when instruction took place in the visual mode than in audio or audio visual modes. The researcher-observers interpret this finding as indicating that "black and Chicano students from lower social classes may be more favorably evaluated if they are seen and not heard."[78] They conclude that in the city of Austin, "educational equality for students from different ethnic and social class backgrounds is a myth . . ."

A study of San Antonio, Tex., involving 133 Mexican American children in Head Start classes, found that teachers, regardless of ethnic group, tended to rate high those students who were proficient in English. This held true whether the criterion was extraversion, positive social behavior, or task orientation. High proficiency in Spanish brought no more favorable teacher ratings than did low proficiency in Spanish. Mexican American teachers did not depart from the norm of rewarding proficiency in English to the exclusion of Spanish.

Differential promotion policies for black and white first graders in Portland, Ore., were studied by Henderson and associates. In general, whites and boys tended more than blacks and girls to be retained. The sex discrepancy was much smaller for Negroes than for whites. Achievement test scores were not the objective basis for promotion or retention decisions. A number of whites were retained even though their achievement scores equalled those of blacks who were promoted. (The children under study tended to be in segregated schools, the children of each racial group attending a racially similar school rather than a nonsegregated school.) Social class differences were also found to be important for the white children. Thus, "white boys of medium-low reading achievement who attended high status schools were retained significantly more often than were those who attended low status schools."[79]

The greater failure rate for white students than for blacks thus reflects not a bias against whites but more likely the reverse. The schools can be interpreted as taking more care with whites, in that they are not promoted without having demonstrated a certain level of accomplishment. That level is lower for blacks. Henderson and associates note that most whites in the study were from lower socioeconomic circumstances while the black children tended to represent a broader social span. Thus the bias takes on more of a racial than a social character.

Howe searched out the effects of race and socioeconomic level on achievement expectancy by 225 teachers (70 black and 185 white) in the Detroit metropolitan area. He found cooperation in all types of schools except that the principal of a middle class black school refused to participate. Since this was a questionnaire study, the results are attitudinal only. No classroom observation took place. Teachers believed that the ability to learn was highest among white middle class students, followed by white lower class, and lower class black students. This applied to reading and mathematics but not in science and social science. "The fact that reading is one of the areas where teachers see racial differences in ability to learn is particularly important and disturbing," wrote Howe, "since school success depends on ability in reading probably more than any other subject."[80] Howe also sees "cause for alarm" in the finding that between 20 to 33 percent of the students are viewed by their teachers as incapable of meeting learning requirements expected of them in 2 years.

Yando, Zigler, and Gates studied the relative effectiveness of black and white adults with lower class children of both races. Subjects were 144 second graders, equally divided among black and white. An experimental, not regular, classroom experience was used. Whether race of teacher (adult) and student was the same turned out to be of no consequence in learning the experimental task. Children scored higher on an IQ test under the tutelage of an effective teacher, regardless of race.

The Yando group may be said to have found that "love is not enough" when it comes to learning. "While warmth and supportiveness motivate children to interact with an adult," they wrote, "it has not been found that such qualities enhance a child's performance on cognitive tasks."[81] Yet, they caution, there seems to be no fixed apportionment of stylistic elements that makes for success in teaching lower class children. Rather, the researchers suggest tentatively that a teaching style which is to help students achieve academically may vary with ethnic group: ". . . For Negro teachers rated as effective this style is embedded within a warm and supportive approach, whereas for effective white teachers it is found within an authoritarian, 'no nonsense' approach."

An excellent example of both styles is found in an autobiographical memoir by the black poet and singer Maya Angelou. In 1941 she entered George Washington High School in Oakland, Calif., where she was one of only three black students. It was, she wrote out of her background in Arkansas, "the first real school I attended."[82] Miss Kirwin, her favorite teacher by far, was white:

> She was stimulating instead of intimidating. Where some of the other teachers went out of their way to be nice to me – to be a "liberal" with me – and others ignored me completely, Miss Kirwin never seemed to notice that I was black and therefore different. I was Miss Johnson and if I had the answer to a question she posed I was never given any more than the word "correct", which was what she said to every other student with the correct answer.[83]

The literature contains many parallel accounts. Unfortunately, few teachers have bothered to record the story from their perspective.

St. John, in a formal study of 956 black and white children, found that teacher behavior affected the two groups in different ways. Especially important for black children was the presence of teachers who were optimistic about their performance and anticipated high expectancies for success. Such orientations by teachers are more important than subject matter proficiency for black achievement.[84]

According to some 20 empirical interracial studies, the teacher in the classroom tends predominantly to be skeptical of the capacity of minority children to achieve beyond minimal levels. Frequently, minority children are ignored by teachers and subjected to considerable discouragement. As in the case of teacher attitude studies, reviewed earlier in this chapter, it seems logical to infer – and some of the empirical materials permit such an inference – that negative teacher attitudes lead to actual discrimination. This, however, is not always the case. Numerous instances are recorded of teachers in nonsegregated schools relating in a productive, essentially just, way to minority students.

EMPIRICAL DESEGREGATION STUDIES

In this section a number of desegregation studies of teacher-student interaction are reviewed.

In 1974, 5 years after a sweeping court-ordered desegregation plan had begun operating in the schools of Charlotte, N.C., the *Charlotte Observer* conducted a public opinion poll of 857 black and white teachers in the schools. Numerous differences were apparent between both groups of teachers. While nearly 70 percent of all teachers reported that a healthy educational atmosphere prevailed in their schools, a racial breakdown reveals the following.[85]

Percent of teachers answering "yes" to the following questions:

Question	Black teachers percent	White teachers percent
1. Do you think integration is worthwhile?	94	56
2. Do you think discipline is a serious problem in your school?	29	64
3. Do you think the quality of education in your school is good?	87	70
4. Do you think students are learning more?	36	27
5. Do you think students are learning less?	10	34
6. Are you optimistic about the future of the school?	87	47

Clearly, black teachers tended to view desegregation as a wholesome educational experience for students, while white teachers were skeptical and disbelieving.

In the study of Goldsboro, N.C. by Mayer and associates, discussed in the previous chapter, white male students were observed to be receiving the most positive reinforcement. Indeed, they "were more than twice as likely to initiate contact with teachers than either black males or black females."[86] Interaction of black male students with teachers was quite likely, on the other hand, to concern discipline. Both black and white teachers acknowledged a certain difficulty in relating to students of the opposite race. According to a high school counselor, "the office receives a large number of complaints from black students accusing white teachers of 'unfair treatment' in class and unfair grading practice."[87] (It should be recalled that black achievement increased relative to that of whites in these schools, and that student interaction was reported by both black and white students as relatively benign.)

Gay studied teacher-student interaction in the schools of Austin, Tex., during 1973. Observers spent a total of 300 hours in various classrooms; 74 teachers and 648 students were included in the study. In addition to observational data, teachers replied to a questionnaire; students supplied their own version of what was happening in the classroom. According to Gay, black children were shown to be receiving significantly fewer educational opportunities:

> . . . Opportunities for black students' intellectual development were simply not provided to the extent made possible to white pupils . . . Blacks received more criticism and were asked questions which required less demanding complex cognitive processes . . . Teachers generally expected white students' achievements to be higher than Blacks' . . . Teachers gave white students answers to questions when they were unable to provide them themselves, in addition to praising and complimenting their correct responses . . . By comparison, interaction with black students was often terminated by asking other students to give answers to questions blacks were unable to answer.[88]

These findings were supported by the firsthand reports of the eight observers who spent a total of 300 hours in classrooms during January and March 1973. Students supplied directly to the investigators data that yielded a picture quite consistent with that drawn from direct observation and teacher questionnaires.

In two poor rural counties in Georgia, Braxton and Bullock interviewed 44 teachers and 208 students before desegregation and a year later. Students were asked first whether they expected teachers to be impartial. Affirmative replies were as follows, in percentage:[89]

Percent of students answering "yes"
to the following statements:

Statement	White students percent	Black students percent
Teachers of the other race will be impartial	52	59
Teachers can be impartial to students of other race	93	65

After 8 full months of desegregation, students were asked to respond to two other statements. Affirmative replies, by percentage, were:[90]

Percent of Students answering 'yes"
to the following statements:

Statement	White students percent	Black students percent
You are treated impartially	27	51
You are allowed to participate equally in class	86	57

The first set of statements elicited an expectation among white students that while black teachers were fully capable of being impartial that there was a good chance they would not be. Expectations of teacher impartiality by black students were more internally consistent: i.e., white teachers were expected to be about as impartial as might be expected. Black students were, in this sense, more realistic. For white students, however, the disparity between potential and expected teacher behavior reflected grave doubt about what desegregation might mean. Indeed, while one-quarter of the black students did not favor desegregation, more than nine-tenths of the white students opposed it.

Replies to the second group of statements indicate a significant switch by white students. In an abstract sense, they are even less willing to concede the possibility of impartiality among black teachers. This stance is probably ideological in inspiration and squares with their earlier overwhelming opposition to desegregation. On the other hand, white students concede that in classrooms taught by black teachers equal treatment is the rule; nearly 9 out of 10 acknowledge that black teachers were impartial. It is, after all, in the classroom that the crucial teacher-student interaction occurs. As for black students, the onset of desegregation moderated somewhat their expectations of impartial treatment. In the main, however, actual experience pretty well corresponded to expectations of black students. (This may be simply another instance of the much-documented cultural fact that blacks "know" whites more accurately than the reverse.)

In the Chesler-Segal study of Alabama, discussed earlier, the role of teachers was examined in two respects: (1) its relation to classroom atmosphere, and (2) its expectancy or nonexpectancy of achievement by the Negro desegregators. While three-quarters of the desegregators regarded their white teachers as fair minded, most teachers permitted white students to establish the tone of the classroom. This laissez-faire attitude of the teachers increased tensions. Where teachers were seen as fair minded, the white students in the classroom were generally also so regarded. Thus, the classroom atmosphere rather well reflected the leadership (or lack of it) shown by teachers.

Some teachers were cruel to the Negro students; "About one-third of the descriptions of unfair behavior identified teachers who called students 'nigger,' or had . . . mispronounced 'Negro.' More than another third of such unfair reports noted that students felt they were singled out by their teachers or mistreated. . ."[90]

Teachers at first underestimated the academic ability of the Negro students: "Only 75 percent of the teachers reported that before the desegregators entered their classes they did not think the Negro students would be as smart as the white students. By the end of the year or two of desegregation, however, half of that 75 percent had changed their minds . . ."[91] Desegregation was an important experience of discovery for numerous people. Many desegregators found they could do as well as white students; many teachers increased their respect for Negro abilities. (One wonders how the white students felt about all this; but, unfortunately, the Chesler-Segal team was unable to interview them.)

Faculty desegregation has been ordered by a number of courts. In Miami, Fl., for example, considerable dissatisfaction with the plan was voiced by teachers; widespread threats were heard that many experienced and older teachers would resign rather than yield to mandatory transfers. Initially, 1,876 teachers were transferred. About 335, or 18 percent of the total directed to transfer, resigned. A school district study found:

> . . . The majority of teachers who terminated had between zero and 3 years experience and . . . more than 75 percent of them were at the lowest educational level. More than one-half . . . were white females and nearly 25 percent were white males.[92]

The magnitude of termination was not large in terms of the district's own experience. (A number of teachers had volunteered to transfer and these reduced the final number subject to mandatory order.) In response to school district inquiries following the transfers, principals reported that "the most commonly noted problem was in teachers' morale where anxiety, apprehension, and inexperience in teaching other ethnic groups were felt to be debilitating."

A study in Shelby County, Tenn., based on questionnaires, found that of 42 teachers, the only ones opposing the practice of rotating teachers were whites teaching predominantly white students.[93] In Louisiana, a report quoted earlier stated acerbically that "many transferred black teachers . . . have not had problems of any kind in dealing with white schools, because they deal with no white students."[94] In these segregated classrooms within desegregated schools, moreover:

> . . . Some teachers enforced racial segregation within the classroom, placing the black students on one side of the room or at the back. In one school, it was reported, a teacher placed all blacks in one corner of the classroom and turned his back to them while teaching.

Later that same year—1970—legal action resulted in a significant reduction in the number of internally segregated schools. One may imagine that such discriminatory practices were rarely, if at all, used by black teachers in these same classrooms.

Northern studies

At several points in earlier chapters one or another aspect of the Riverside, Calif. desegregation experience has been examined. Thus, in the preceding chapter, it was noted that the Gerard group of researchers highlighted the failure of teachers to welcome minority children. This failure, it was further suggested, was communicated to the white children who followed suit.

Purl, the research director of the school district, supplied an account of the viewpoint of Superintendent E. Raymond Berry:

> Desegregation was named by [Berry] as an extremely powerful intervention which has caused numerous and quite radical changes in the instructional programs for all children. Hitherto successful teachers found their classes suddenly containing children who not only extended the lower limits of the achievement range, but seemed unresponsive to the "tried and true" methods of pedogogy. . .
>
> The first reaction was projecting blame. "Do 'they' know what 'they' did to us when 'they' gave us these kids!" Or "we can't do anything unless we get smaller classes or more help."

> The next phase was a vigorous attack on the behavior of minority children, who, incidentally adapted quite readily and soon presented few incidents of unacceptable behavior.
>
> Next came a period of truce. It was as if each had said to the other, "we won't bother you if you don't bother us." Minority children sat in classrooms, appropriately scattered around the room, but with few exceptions they did not enter into discussions, were not called upon, nor did they seem to be following the class activity. But they bothered no one. Needless to say, little learning went on for these children unless they were highly self-motivated and capable students.
>
> Slowly, individual teachers began to look for ways to alter their instruction in their attempts to help children. Each success encouraged more until after a time teachers were instructing each child according to his needs. Different teachers progressed at different rates from one end of this continuum to the other, while some never made it to the final stages.[95]

Thus, Riverside teachers in desegregated schools travelled, more or less, though four stages: (1) projection of blame, (2) criticism of children, (3) truce with children, and (4) critical self-examination. Much in Purl's account supports the findings of the Gerard group.

Johnson, an associate of Gerard, focused his study on the influence of the teacher. Two major findings emerged. First, student achievement was affected by teacher expectations. Second, racial bias was evident in teacher grading practices. Minority children were systematically evaluated by teachers as less bright than Anglo children. Student achievement was closely related to the degree to which the teacher was racially biased. High achieving black and Chicano children were especially sensitive to teacher bias. As Johnson reported: "High achieving minority children entering high and low [teacher] discrimination classrooms show changes in achievement which differ by almost a full standard deviation even though their initial verbal achievement scores are virtually identical."[96] Where achievement decrements were recorded, they were greater in high than in low discrimination classrooms.

Discrimination played a definite role in grading. The greater the degree of teacher discrimination, the larger the grade differences among black, Chicano, and Anglo children. Black children apparently felt the major brunt of the bias for high discrimination teachers because they did not seem to grade high and low achieving black students differently. On the other hand, teachers low in bias tended to be easier in grading minority children. It would seem an understatement to conclude as Johnson does that "teachers may play a critical role in the success of a desegregation program."[97]

Deslonde, at the time teaching at the University of California, Riverside, worked closely with teachers in two schools of that city. He supervised student teachers at Arroyo and Valencia schools. In general, he reports, there seemed to be an "absence of strong convictions that all children can achieve equally given equal chances."[98] At Valencia, especially, there was a sense of aloofness and distance: "While these teachers are surely not racist in the usual sense of the word, they are having some trouble getting their program across to children who may not be clean, docile, and alert to the nuances of middle class disciplinary measures."[99] At Arroyo, however, more educational leadership and purpose seemed to work, and a greater acceptance of minority students was apparent.

During the first year of desegregation – at the time of Berry's initial stages–Mercer, also at the University of California, Riverside, found teachers to be deeply concerned with the issue of discipline.[100] This was the pretruce period and clearly before the stage of critical self-examination.

It will be recalled that Gerard favored the modeling hypothesis, i.e., that teacher bias against minority children was somehow communicated to Anglo children who then expressed – or intensified – their bias against Chicano and black classmates. In support of this hypothesis, Gerard and associates stress that Anglo student bias did not exist where teachers were not present – that is, on the playground. There, athletic prowess had its day and individual merit became the basis of student judgment.[101] The playground was the only place in the school, according to Gerard and associates, where integration rather than desegregation could be seen at work.

Miller has written a summary of the negative effect of teacher bias in Riverside. "Teachers," he writes, "appear to behave quite differently toward children of different ethnic groups."[102] Teacher prejudice was shown to have considerable consequence for the educational welfare of students.

The negative impact of teacher bias was strengthened by the generally tokenistic distribution of minority children among the classrooms under study. This, of course, was a factor which the school system rather than the individual teacher controlled. Each of the negative characteristics fed on the other.

In Evanston, Ill., Hsia conducted an evaluation of a 3 year desegregation program. At several points, attention was paid to the role of the teacher. Desegregation did not drive teachers away; instead, after its onset, teacher attrition started to decline. Black teachers, who increased in number–as did the number of black administrators–over the 3 years, tended to rate black and white students higher than did white teachers. This finding is consistent with other studies. At the same time, the presence of dual achievement standards, with less required of black students, was acknowledged by half of all teachers. Teachers rated black students less positively and more negatively than they rated white students.[103]

In the Kalamazoo study, a distinctive pattern of racial preference by elementary teachers emerged, at least as interpreted by students. Coats and associates wrote:

> White children in all white classrooms reported that their teacher liked them better than did white children in majority white classrooms, who in turn, said that their teacher liked them better than did white children in majority black classrooms. . .
>
> Black children . . . (1) did not view their ideas to be important to the teacher as did white children; [and] (2) thought their teacher got angry more frequently than did white children. . .[104]

Less of a pattern could be seen in the high schools.

Schlesinger and Amore, in their study of a school in White Plains, N.Y., remarked on a phenomenon which is virtually never discussed in the literature: "Many of the black children will accuse the teacher of racial prejudice – whether they really believe it or not – in order to manipulate a situation in their favor."[105] Such accusations are defensive in nature even when the object of attack – i.e., the teacher – is blameless, as indicated by certain other aspects of the school's life. For example, the authors point out that even after 4 years, black children occupy a very marginal position in the affairs of the school. Under such conditions, somebody merits "blame" and it is not surprising that black students will, out of resentment, strike at the nearest authority figure – the teacher.

The empirical desegregation studies just reviewed were made in seven Southern States and four Northern States. Nearly all the former occurred in a context of rather widespread mandatory desegregation while the latter tended to occur in a context of token, voluntary desegregation. Northern school districts which desegregated under court order have not conducted or published studies of the role of the teacher; nor have such districts been studied by independent researchers. Rarely, have so many known so little about so much!

Based on the 17 studies in this section, it is possible to point to the classroom teacher as the pivot of successful desegregation. Unsuccessful desegregation can be guaranteed by action of school boards and central administration; under such policy conditions, little constructive can occur in the classroom. Given a strong and positive policy position, however, the classroom teacher becomes the central element.

Black teachers and principals in the desegregated school seem to be strongly affirmative factors. This importance is based in part on the optimism about students they bring along and in part on their symbolic value to both black *and white* students. Yet white and at times black teachers in desegregated schools tend to prefer, if not outright favor, the white child. Even in the absence of blatant racist attitudes, personal cruelty to minority children lingers in the desegregated as well as in the segregated school.

A study of teacher-student interaction clarifies the distinction between desegregation and integration. Respect for every student and attending to the educational interests of each child would seem to be the goals of the desegregated school. The process of attaining these goals is the core of integration.

THE PYGMALION ISSUE

According to ancient mythology, Pygmalion sculpted a statue of a beautiful woman and thereupon fell in love with it. He appealed to Aphrodite, the goddess of love and beauty, to bring the statue to life. Aphrodite obliged and thus Galatea came into being. Pygmalion married her. The "Pygmalion effect" is the term applied to broadly analogical events in which the subject has a directing hand in producing the very response he or she wishes from another person. In other words, one creates the very thing wanted. Social psychologist Rosenthal, in a series of experiments, found that the results depended significantly on action of the experimenters. They tended to obtain the results they expected to get. The question arose as to the possible application of this phenomenon in school instruction. That is, do students tend to measure up – or down – to expectations that teachers have for them?

Rosenthal and Jacobson constructed an experiment whereby they informed teachers in a school that certain of their students were "late bloomers" and could be expected to achieve much more than their school records might indicate. This was not true, in fact. The findings, however, indicated that the "late bloomers" had indeed bloomed. They achieved at a higher rate than classmates not so designated but whose ability was comparable. The researchers drew the conclusion that the outcome resulted from the raising of the teachers' expectations and a communication of these higher expectations to the students. This communication was differential; students not expected to achieve at high levels were assumed to have received "messages" to that effect. A large literature of criticism and defense has grown up around the Pygmalion project.[106] Yet, the weight of the evidence seems to favor a hunch of teacher influence on, if not determination of, student achievement. This would be in line with a great mass of empirical data drawn from classroom experience.

Numerous research activities have been carried out to test the hunch. Few however, have involved interracial subjects. As in so much psychological research, findings in studies made on one-race subjects may have little relevance for interracial situations.

Rosenthal devised a convenient classification to account for four broad groups of mediating mechanisms for the Pygmalion effect in classrooms. These are climate, feedback, input, and output.[107] By climate he means a certain atmosphere created by the teacher in which students for whom the teacher holds higher expectancy are treated more warmly. Ample empirical evidence of this has been cited in earlier pages. Feedback covers the practice whereby a teacher pays more attention to some students than to others. Again this phenonmenon is familiar from the empirical evidence. Input refers to the greater volume of teacher effort that goes into teaching those of whom much is expected. The study by Gay documents the importance of this factor. Output describes the tendency of teachers to give high-expectancy students a greater chance to "show their stuff."

In many American classrooms, as seen from the empirical materials, the minority child is stigmatized. His or her minority status becomes a discrediting characteristic. Kleck points out that teacher expectancy studies could be set up to test stigma effects directly. That is, teachers would be told the minority children were found to be hopelessly slow – no-bloomers, so to speak. Then at the year's end, these children would be tested to learn whether low teacher expectations had indeed operated to dampen minority achievement. Since such an experiment would likely involve deliberate injury to children, ethical considerations preclude carrying it out.[108] As historical and legal materials in chapter 1 and 2 indicate, minority children were sometimes stigmatized to the extreme where they were excluded from school altogether. More recently, predominantly minority schools have been stigmatized so far as resources and curriculum are concerned. It would hardly be surprising, therefore, to discover stigmatization operating within some interracial schools, let alone in segregated schools. Certainly, the bulk of the empirical materials say as much.

Three formal studies of teacher expectancy in an interracial setting are reported here.

Rubovits and Maehr studied the interaction of 264 black and white seventh and eight graders in three junior high schools with 66 white teachers – actually college undergraduates. Classroom observers participated. Teachers were informed that certain students of both races were more intellectually capable than others. A Pygmalion effect was demonstrated for white students. That is, white students who were reported to be especially gifted did receive more attention from teachers.

The reverse, however, was true of purportedly gifted black students. Rubovits and Maehr reported:

> Black students were given less attention, ignored more, praised less, and criticized more. More startling . . . it is the gifted black who is given the least attention, is the least praised, and the most criticized, even when comparing him to his nongifted black counterpart.[109]

This finding was also made in the Riverside study by Johnson who discovered that high achieving minority students suffered most from a highly discriminatory teacher.[110] For some biased teachers, the presence of obviously talented minority students is too jarring a contradiction of the stereotype of a supposed incapacity to learn.

Tuckman and Bierman studied what they call a "Galatea" effect. Subjects were 805 black junior high and high school students in Montclair, N.J. The researchers wanted to know how self-expectations and teacher expectations would be affected if students "belonging" in a certain ability group were arbitrarily placed in a higher group. Students so placed numbered 421; the remaining 384 students, of a comparable academic level, were assigned to the usual group which was lower.

Instead of foundering under intensified academic competition, report Tuckman and Bierman, "among high school students, 54 percent of those moved up were subsequently recommended for the higher group as compared to only 1 percent of the controls."[111] After only one semester, in fact, the upwardly displaced students scored higher on achievement tests. Yet, it should also be noted that 46 percent of the upwardly displaced were not later recommended by teachers to remain in the higher group. The researchers conceded that much more study is needed. On the other hand, they concluded, "if students arbitrarily moved up can improve in performance and be absorbed by the higher group, as was shown in this study, then not moving them up is denying them the opportunity to enhance their self-expectations and consequently their performance."[112]

A third study was done by Coates in North Carolina. It involved 48 white college-age adults who were told, falsely, that two black and two white 9-year-old boys performed at equal achievement levels. The adults then helped prepare each child to take a test; the adults did not actually see the children take the test. Coates found that the "teachers" related to the black children more negatively than to the whites. Black children tended more to be characterized as dull, passive, and unfriendly. Male adults made more negative statements while instructing black than while working with white students. In testing the two groups of children differentially, Coates observes, "the adults were not responding to behavioral differences in children of the two races."[113] Rather, they were expressing a bias.

Use of the expression "Pygmalion effect" is an unfortunate practice since it does not reflect the crucial episode of the original myth – i.e., the transformation of Galatea by Aphrodite. In the classroom, the nearest thing to Aphrodite is the teacher, and the distance is often large. The teacher cannot be both Pygmalion and Aphrodite. According to the Galatea effect, he or she could be neither.

Mythology aside, these three studies strengthen the main finding of empirical studies which point up the important role of teachers in eliciting responses and setting up productive interaction between student and teacher.

RACE OF TEACHER

How does race of teacher affect the learning of minority children? Historically the question made little sense. During the era of statutory segregation, black teachers were restricted to working in black schools. Given the extraordinary deprivation visited upon these schools, the learning that was accomplished could only have been minimal. The precise effect of the teacher was untraceable. In the North, as late as the 1940's and 1950's most black teachers were in elementary schools, especially in predominantly black schools. Exceedingly few taught in high schools except those attended by a sizable number of black children. Traditionally, therefore, black children were taught by black teachers. In exceptional situations, some were taught by whites. In private schools and colleges founded in the South after the Civil War by northern missionaries, white teachers were the rule. Bond has written of their competence and dedication.[114] By the 1930's, however, both DuBois and Bond characterized the treatment black children in northern public schools received as typically harsh and even cruel.[115] A prominent feature of the growing minority disillusionment with urban schools of the 1960's were charges that the white staff was insensitive to black children and uninterested in teaching them. Whether or not this was a fair general characterization, numerous instances of it could be documented.

McMillan, in a study of 438 black and white students in 16 inner-city schools, found that "racially-mixing a school does not impair or weaken the magnitude of teacher influence or the achievement level of Negro or Caucasian students."[116] Black students, he reported, did not perceive their white teachers' expectations of them as negative. In a study of 154 black 11th grade male students, Glick found that there was no difference in achievement on an experimental task as between students who had had a white or a black teacher.[117] Oberg divided 487 black fourth graders into two groups; middle class and lower class. She found that the former performed better with black teachers and the latter with white teachers.[118] No compelling reason for this outcome was cited.

Nevertheless, there are those who contend that black teachers are distinctively better prepared to teach black children as a matter of race.[119] This view fails to consider contrary evidence. As Gordon wrote:

> That in New York City the workers are predominantly white makes it easy for the conflict [between teachers and children] to be viewed as ethnic in origin unless one looks at the situation in Washington, D.C., where Negroes are heavily represented on the educational staff, but some of the problems between professionals and clients are no less present.

One could also refer to some schools in St. Louis that are staffed primarily by blacks.[121]

Silver's analysis of Washington, D.C., cited earlier in the chapter, supports Gordon. In his indictment of ghetto schooling, Clark focuses not on the teacher as such, and in no sense on the teacher's race. Instead, he speaks more broadly of the school and the dominant community:

> The public schools are damaging those human beings which this society considers expendable . . . This society has opted to permit public education to destroy the capacity of those human beings whom it is unwilling to accept, to prevent them from becoming effective or constructive members of a larger society.[122]

"The enemy," Clark continued, "is more formidable than color; America's brand of racism infects both blacks and whites."[123]

The issue of teacher-race and student achievement is unrelated to the general problem of employing more minority teachers. That most teachers are white, even in areas where many blacks live, is not the consequence of equal competition or research that has demonstrated the superior ability of whites over minority teachers. Contemporary efforts to overcome this general disparity do not depend on demonstrating minority superiority though research. As equal citizens, minority communities have an equal claim to share in the staffing of the schools in which their children are being educated. Probably every other minority in American history has demanded and, in time, obtained such access to the public schools. One of the central elements in the demand has been a desire to establish school employment as a possible career for minority children. If, to the contrary, minority teachers are compelled first to demonstrate that they are more effective than majority-group teachers, they will be subjected to a standard which has never been applied to any other group.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Only a handful of studies have been made of interracial faculty-student interaction in higher education. Three of these date from the 1960's.

Earlier, Bindman's findings on Negro student achievement at the University of Illinois were examined. He found that poorly prepared Negro students were reluctant to acknowledge their need for special help and so tended not to seek it. This tendency was furthered by the students' general feeling of social isolation on the campus. While some staff members "perform their duties in an openly discriminatory manner,"[124] the Negro student, Bindman continues, "is often surprised at the 'good treatment' he receives from faculty as administrators and . . . in only a few cases perceives faculty members as hostile to him."[125]

Boney reports on Negro social style on white campuses.[126] Reporting from a northern university, Boney observes: ". . . Non-white students tend to assign a disproportionate amount of importance to the evaluation of whites with reference to their role expectations. Docile and submissive behaviors in racially integrated learning situations are expected and rewarded by many white teachers."[127]

Helton reviewed the experience of about 300 Negro graduate students in five predominantly white Tennessee State Colleges. Academically, they did quite well; they participated widely in extracurricular activities; "28 percent were very sensitive to the prejudice shown by some of their instructors." At another point, Helton referred to "the underlying but unmentioned fact that many faculty members are biased and prejudiced toward the Negro graduate student."[128]

Three more recent studies were completed around the turn of the decade.

Davis reported the findings of a study by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in which over 160 black freshmen in predominantly white public campuses in one State were interviewed. Contrary to findings in other studies – such as Bindman's, at the University of Illinois – Davis noted that "we could detect no groundswell of feeling of oppression by academic demands, or unusual concern about performance."[129] Few students spoke of a need for tutoring or remedial classes. According to Davis, "a few felt some instructors were prejudiced, but more reacted to the unexpected mediocrity they had found in some of their teachers."[130] Especially among black upper classmen could be found a firm conception "of the college administration as the epitome of white establishment and therefore natural enemies."[131] Overall, one is impressed by the students' definition of the problematic black situation on campus in terms of academics rather than compensatory efforts.

Rafky studied black faculty in predominantly white, non-southern higher instituions. He received completed questionnaires from 699 black teachers, representing perhaps as high as 90 percent of the available number in the country. By pairing black and white teachers, he found that white teachers felt more awkward with black students than did black teachers. Yet, the latter were only slightly less so. In the classroom white teachers frequently felt awkward in the presence of black students. Most perplexing to these teachers are black militants and black demands for special or preferential academic treatment.[132] Black faculty relate somewhat ambiguously to white students. Mutual respect and cordiality reportedly characterize their interaction. On the other hand, "many black faculty members *believe* that white students resent them, but they are not certain . . ."[133] Cytrynbaum, in studying interracial faculty relations with students at a southern black college, found that the presence of white teachers had "disruptive consequences." He wrote that "the white teachers were more tense, disturbed, and threatened by the challenges initiated by male students and they were more supportive, bordering on seductiveness, towards the female students. . ."[134]

So fragmentary is the coverage of these studies of higher education that general conclusions cannot properly be drawn. At the same time, there seems to be little reason to expect a spirit of acceptance and equal treatment to obtain on the campuses. Yet, there seems to be far less evidence on this level of biased classroom teachers.

INSERVICE TRAINING

As noted at the outset of this chapter, the entire span of human actors in the school must be considered if the importance of any single group of actors is to be estimated. Yet, in devising remedies for school situations in which many students are victimized by racist treatment, only teachers are singled out for treatment. School board members, superintendents, and principals are ordinarily not regarded as being in need of inservice training in this area.

Edwards analyzed the records of a series of seminars conducted by teachers of disadvantaged children. It was hoped that they might thus become better teachers by developing improved attitudes; panels met from 15 to 20 times. Edwards reported that: (1) the panels were never clear as to their goals; (2) "most of the conversation seemed superficial and at times banal,"[135] and (3) successful teachers were not those with the "best" attitudes but those who had worked out classroom techniques and procedures that are successful in the sense of keeping teacher and students, hence administrators and parents, reasonably content with the classroom situation.[136]

A small-scale example of teacher preparation for desegregation rather than disadvantage is described by Zinberg.[137] Teachers from Arlington, Mass., a white middle-class suburb of Boston, met with teachers from an all-Negro Roxbury school in groups of 16 for two sessions of 1 hour and 45 minutes each. A psychiatrist led the group discussions. The aim was to learn what to expect when the Arlington schools would receive some Negro children from Boston. Although the time was minimal, apparently the Arlington teachers came nearer to comprehending the human hurt of segregation and discrimination. Zinberg concluded:

> . . . The problem to be faced by the teacher who chooses to participate in this social change is clearly a larger one than simply presiding over integrated classes in such a way that no unpleasant incidents occur. He must work with deeper hurt feelings from past difficulties and with the prejudices that exist by the time children reach his classroom.[138]

Zinberg makes clear the need of the teacher to face up to his own prejudices.

A few studies have been made of efforts to change the social-ethnic attitudes of student teachers.[139] The findings are rather indeterminate. In addition, the records of a number of symposia and workshops as well as special guides to classroom practice in the desegregated school are available. Many of these are filled with helpful concrete suggestions, far too numerous even to list here. While some are anchored in research, others are of a commonsense variety, richly informed by experience.[140]

The most basic problem of existing research in inservice training is the failure to study the practical classroom application of findings. Typically, a summer workshop is held; participants are pretested and posttested; a positive change in attitudes may be recorded. This outcome is hailed as evidence of a successful experience. But no effort is usually made to discover whether the classroom teacher acts any differently when he or she returns to the classroom. A special value thus attaches to studies or simply: discerning accounts that point to inservice training that operates in the very heart of the everyday educational experience.[141]

CONCLUSION

Although the number of formal studies is still very small, it is clear that school board members, superintendents, and principals have lagged seriously in supplying educational leadership in interracial settings. Studies of teacher attitudes suggest strongly a generally negative orientation toward minority children. Empirical analyses of interracial classrooms demonstrate the practical consequences of negative teacher attitudes. Examination of actually desegregated schools underscores the critical role of the teacher and principal. Positive examples are available in some number. The presence of black staff is especially important for symbolizing a break with past policies of segregation. Also, black teachers help broaden the career possibilities of black children. Finally, black teachers should be seen as net additions to the supply of quality teachers. Evidence does not support the contention that teachers of a certain race are unable to teach children of opposite race. Experimental studies by psychologists are beginning to provide tested knowledge about systematic effects of teacher expectancy on student achievement.

It is a matter of experience and, increasingly, of systematic observation and study that the student's achievement is significantly dependent upon the teacher. In turn, teachers are prime actors in an institution still bearing major elements of racism. Personal attitudes to teachers very often express dominant community attitudes on racial and social topics. Minority children in schools labor under the accumulated weight of these ideological burdens. Somewhat encouraging is the volume of reports, frequently based on responses of the minority students themselves, that demonstrate the presence in a number of classrooms of an exceptionally constructive and accepting spirit.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Central Advisory Council for Education, *Children and their Primary Schools*, I (London: HMSO, 1967) p. 463.

[2] *NEA Task Force on School Desegregation in Louisiana* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Feb. 15-22, 1970), p. 12.

[3] Alabama League for the Advancement of Education, *The Slow Death of the Black Educator in Alabama*, July 1, 1971, p. 32. See, also, Patricia H. Lutterbie, *Black Administrator: Winners and Losers in the Desegregation-Integration Process*, April 1974, ERIC ED. 090 657. This study relates to Florida, 1960-1972.

[4] Albert Sidney Baxter, *Status and Characteristics of Displaced Negro Teachers in Arkansas, 1954-1968* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1970), pp. 96,100. See, also, Jesse Lee Allen, *The Effects of School Desegregation on the Employment Status of Negro Principals in North Carolina* (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1969).

[5] Clifton M. Claye, "Problems of Cross-Over Teachers," *Integrated Education*, 8 (September-October 1970), p. 15.

[6] Harmon Zeigler and Michael Boss, "Racial Problems and Policy in the American Public Schools," *Sociology of Education*, 47 (Summer 1974), p. 329.

[7] David Thomas Hawkes, *An Exploration of the Problems of Teacher Ethnocentricity and Law Expectations in an Urban Integrated School* (Master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1971), p.2.

[8] Allen, *Effects of School Desegregation*, p. 133.

[9] Zeigler and Boss, "Racial Problems and Policy," p. 324.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 330-331.

[11] James D. Jones, Edsel L. Erickson, and Ronald Crowell, "Increasing the Gap Between Whites and Blacks. Tracking as a Contributory Source," *Education and Urban Society*, 4 (May, 1972), p. 345.

[12] Charles David Moody, Sr., *Black Superintendents in Public School Districts: Trends and Conditions* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971), p. 1.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[14] Robert D. Frelow, "Minority Administrators and Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, (May-June 1973), pp. 28-29.

[15] Moody, *Black Superintendents*, p. 24.

[16] Jayjia Hsia, *Integration in Evanston, 1967-71: A Longitudinal Evaluation* (Evanston, Illinois: Educational Testing Service, August 1971), p. 115.

[17] Stephen B. Lawton, "Minority Administrators in Berkeley. A Progress Report," *Urban Education*, 6 (January 1972) pp. 321-330.

[18] Michael E. Stones, "School Administrator Attitudes and Racism," *Integrated Education*, 11 (March-April 1973), p. 59.

[19] Morris Eugene Olds, *Teachers' Reaction to Faculty Desegregation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970), p. 114.

[20] Robert L. Crain (ed.). *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of Desegregation*, (Chicago, Illinois, National Opinion Research Center, October 1973), (ERIC ED. 085 426).

[21] See Martha Turnage, *The Principal: Change-Agent in Desegregation* (Chicago, Ill.,: Integrated Education Associates, 1972).

[22] Preston R. Wilcox, "Teacher Attitudes and Student Achievement," *Teachers College Record*, 68 (1966-1967) 374 See, also, Robert R. Dunwell, Doreen G. Kelgaard, David Raak et. al. *The Assessment of Informal Factors Affecting Teaching and Learning in a Ghetto High School. Denver, Colorado Manual High School*, 1971 (ERIC ED 052 281).

[23] Urban Education Task Force, "Report on Urban Education," *Congressional Record*, January 20, 1970, E 52.

[24] Catherine Bodard Silver, *Black Teachers in Urban Schools. The Case of Washington, D.C.* (N.Y.: Praeger, 1973), p. 160.

[25] John U. Ogbu, *The Next Generation. An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood*, (N.Y.: Academic Press, 1974), p. 156.

[26] Gary Reeves Harris, *A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability is Held Constant* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967), p. 62. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6738).

[27] George E. North and O. Lee Buchanan, "Teacher Views of Poverty Area Children," *Journal of Educational Research*, October 1967, p. 55.

[28] David Henry Elliott, *Social Origins and Values of Teachers and their Attitudes to Students from Poverty Backgrounds* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968), p. 97.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 158.

[30] Thomas H. Hawkes and Norma F. Furst, "Race, Socio-Economic Situation, Achievement, I.Q., and Teacher Ratings of Students' Behavior as Factors Relating to Anxiety in Upper Elementary School Children, "*Sociology of Education*, 44 (1971), p. 349. See, also, same authors, "An Investigation of the (Mis) Conceptions of Pre-and In-Service Teachers as to the Manifestation of Anxiety in Upper Elementary School Children from Different Racial-Socioeconomic Backgrounds," *Psychology in the Schools*, 10 (1973), p. 23-32.

[31] Ronald G. Corwin and Marilyn Schmit, "Teachers in Inner City Schools: A Survey of a Large City School System," *Theory Into Practice*, 8 (1969), p. 218.

[32] Judith B. Spellman, Gertrude D. Peterson, and Ann H. Rosenthal, *Adapting to Changing Racial and Ethnic Composition: A Survey of San Francisco Teachers and Principals.* (Menlo Park, Calif. Stanford Research Institute, May 15, 1967), p. 15.

[33] Puran L. Rajpal, "Teacher Judgments of Minority Children" *Integrated Education*, 10 (November-December 1972), p. 35.

[34] Eddie D. Smith, *Attitudes of Bibb County Elementary School Teachers Toward Integrated Schools.* (Master's thesis, Fort Valley State College, 1971), pp. 27-28.

[35] Cordell Wynn, "Black and White in Bibb County Classrooms," *Integrated Education,* 9 (July-August 1971), p. 16.

[36] Ronald G. Corwin, *Reform and Organizational Survival. The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change,* (New York: Wiley, 1973), pp. 374-375.

[37] Barbara H. Long and Edmund H. Henderson, *The Effect of Pupils' Race, Class, Test Scores, and Classroom Behavior on the Academic Expectancies of Southern and Non-Southern White Teachers,* April 1972, p. 6. (ERIC ED 063 422).

[38] Theodore W. Parsons, Jr., *Ethnic Cleavage in a California School* (Doctoral dissertation in Education, Stanford University, 1965) University Microfilms Order No. 66-2602).

[39] This town is Castroville, Calif.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 139.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 271; see, also, p. 281.

[44] *Ibid.*, pp. 296-297 and *passim.*

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 361, 363, and 368.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 391.

[48] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Teachers and Students. Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students.* Report V: Mexican American Education Study. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 1973), p. 43.

[49] Gregg Jackson and Cecilia Cosca, "The Inequality of Educational Opportunity in the Southwest: An Observational Study of Ethnically Mixed Classrooms," *American Educational Research Journal,* 11 (Summer 1974), p. 227.

[50] Albert Sidney Beckham, "A Study of Race Attitudes in Negro Children of Adolescent Age," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 29 (1934-1935) 25.

[51] Ellis and Wiggins, *Cooperation, Aggression and Learning in a Bi-racial* Classroom, p. 54.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 79

[53] Daniel L. Rosenhan, "Effects of Social Class and Race on Responsiveness to Approval and Disapproval," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 4 (1966) 254.

[54] Lois-ellin Datta, Earl Schaefer, and Malcolm Davis, *Sex and Scholastic Aptitude as Variables in Teachers' Ratings of the Adjustment and Classroom Behavior of Negro and Other Seventh Grade Students,* 1966, p. 20. (ERIC ED 028 206). See also *Journal of Educational Psychology*), 59 (1968) 94-101.

[55] Robert T. Amos, "The Accuracy of Negro and White Children's Predictions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Negro Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* 21 (1952) 134.

[56] Elinor Pancoast, *The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools* (Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956), p. 103.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[58] Mark A. Chesler, *Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms,* unpublished paper prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-17, 1967.

[59] Elias Blake, Jr., *A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,* unpublished paper prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[63] Chesler, "Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instructions in Interracial Classroom," p. 3.

[64] David Gottlieb, "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," August 1963. Later published in *Sociology of Education,* Summer 1964.

[65] *Ibid.* p. 15.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[68] Edward A. Nelsen and Norman P. Uhl, "The Social Environments of Segregated and Desegregated Schools," *Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology,* 3 (Summer 1973), pp. 49-50 (mimeographed).

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[70] Bernice Demsky Brooks, *A Study of Ninety-Five Children Traveling by Bus to a K-5 School as Part of the Open Enrollment Program in a Large Urban School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1969), p. 103.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 96-97.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[75] Carolyn E. Thompson and Frances L. Dyke, *First Interim Evaluation Report: Urban-Suburban Pupil Transfer Program 1971-1972* (Rochester, N.Y.: City School District, August 1972), p. 46.

[76] Robert Lawrence Byalick, *Expressed Preference and Observed Use of Positive Reinforcement in Biracial Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972), pp. 63-64; and Byalick and Donald N. Bersoff, "Reinforcement Practices of Black and White Teachers in Integrated Classrooms," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 66 (1974), p. 478.

[77] Byalick, *Expressed Preference,* p. 63.

[78] Mary Jensen and Lawrence B. Rosenfeld, "Influence of Mode of Presentation, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Teachers' Evaluations of Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 66 (1974), p. 546.

[79] Norman B. Henderson, Barbara A. Goffeney, Bruce V. Butler, and Quentin D. Clarkson, "Differential Rates of School Promotion from First Grade for White and

Negro, Male and Female 7-Year Olds," *Psychology in the Schools*, 8 (1971), p. 106.

[80] Frederick Charles Howe, *Teacher Perceptions Toward the Learning Ability of Students from Differing Racial and Socio-Economic Backgrounds* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 42.

[81] Regina Yando, Edward Zigler, and Maxine Gates, "The Influence of Negro and White Teachers Rated as Effective or Noneffective on the Performance of Negro and White Lower-Class Children," *Developmental Psychology*, 5 (September 1971), p. 298.

[82] Maya Angelou, *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings* (N.Y.: Random House, 1969), p. 209.

[83] *Ibid.*, pp. 210-211.

[84] Nancy H. St. John, *School Integration, Classroom Climate, And Achievement*, January 1971 (ERIC ED 052 269).

[85] *Charlotte Observer*, July 8, 1974.

[86] Robert R. Mayer, Charles E. King, Anne Borders-Patterson, and James S. McCullough, *The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. A Case Study in the Analysis of Educational Policy* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974), p. 53.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[88] Geneva Gay, *Differential Dyadic Interactions of Black and White Teachers with Black and White Pupils in Recently Desegregated Social Studies Classrooms: A Function of Teacher and Pupil Ethnicity Final Report*, January 1974, pp. 273, 280, 282, and 283 (ERIC ED 091 489).

[89] Mary Victoria Braxton and Charles S. Bullock III, "Teacher Partiality in Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, 10 (July-August 1972), p. 43.

[90] Chesler and Segal, *Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South*, p. 42.

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 78.

[92] *Evaluation of Desegregation 1970-71* (Miami, Fl.; Dade County Public Schools, June 1972), p. 83. With reference to Palm Beach, Florida, see Neal Justin, "Is Busing Helping Students?" *Changing Education*, (Summer 1974) p. 38.

[93] Morris Eugene Olds, *Teachers' Reactions to Faculty Desegregation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970), p. 114.

[94] *NEA Task Force on School Desegregation in Louisiana* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, February 1970), p. 12.

[95] Mabel C. Purl to present writer, July 24, 1974.

[96] Eugene B. Johnson, *Teacher Influences in the Desegregated Classroom: Factors Mediating the School Desegregation Experience*, p. 11 (unpublished).

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[98] James L. Deslonde, "How Can We Really Integrate the Schools?" *Integrated Education*, 10 (May-June 1972), p. 51 (emphasis in original).

[99] James L. Deslonde and Elisabeth G. Flach, *The Cadre Approach to Teacher Training: Developing Change Agents for Desegregated Schools* April 1972, p. 15 (ERIC ED 063 444).

[100] Jane R. Mercer, "Issues and Dilemmas in School Desegregation: A Case Study," *Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems, Proceedings*, 1968, p. 8 (reprint).

[101] Harold B. Gerard, Terrence D. Jackson, and Edward S. Conolley, *Social Contact in the Desegregated Classroom*, pp. 21-22 (Unpublished).

[102] Norman Miller, *Riverside School Study: Summary and Conclusions*, p. 24 (unpublished).

[103] Hsia, *Integration in Evanton*, pp. 100, 119, 126.

[104] William D. Coats, James W. Booth, and David E. Bartz, *A Longitudinal Study of Desegregation in Kalamazoo, Michigan*, September 7, 1972, pp. 15-16.

[105] Ina Schlesinger and Michael D'Amore, *Children in the Balance* (New York: Citation Press, 1971), p. 56.

[106] See Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson, *Pygmalion in the Classroom. Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968).

[107] Robert Rosenthal, *On the Social Psychology of the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Further Evidence for Pygmalion Effects and their Mediating Mechanisms* (New York: M S S Modular Publication, 1974), Module 53, pp. 17-23.

[108] See Robert E. Kleck, *The Role of Stigma as a Factor in Social Interaction* (Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968), pp. 16-17.

[109] Pamela C. Rubovits and Martin L. Maehr, "Pygmalion Black and White," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25 (1973), p. 217.

[110] Johnson, *Teacher Influences in the Desegrated Classroom*, p. 11.

[111] Bruce W. Tuckman and Milton Bierman, *Beyond Pygmalion: Galatea in the School*, 1971, p. 18. (ERIC ED 047 077).

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[113] Brian Coates, "White Adult Behavior Toward Black and White Children," *Child Development*, 43 (1972) p. 152.

[114] Horace Mann Bond, *Black American Scholars. A Study of Their Beginnings* (Detroit, Mich.: Balamp Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 22-24.

[115] W. E. B. DuBois, "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" *Journal of Negro Education*, July 1935, p. 329 and Horace Mann Bond, *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order* (New York: Octagon, 1966 reprint), p. 386.

[116] Joseph Howard McMillan, *The Influence of Caucasian Teachers on Negro and Caucasian Students in Segregated and Racially Mixed Inner-City Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967), p. 69.

[117] Irvin David Glick, "Does Teacher's Skin Color Matter?" *Integrated Education*, 9 (September-October 1971), p. 28.

[118] Hjordis G. Ohberg, "Does the Black Child Need a Black Teacher?" *Integrated Education*, (March-April 1972), p. 28.

[119] See, for example the view of a black member of the New York City school board, Isaiah E. Robinson, Jr., "Preparation for Life: The Black Classroom," p. 8 in Jim Haskins (ed.), *Black Manifesto for Education* (New York: Morrow, 1973).

[120] Edmund W. Gordon, in L. P. Miller and Edmund W. Gordon (eds.) *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (New York: AMS Press, 1974), p. 457.

[121] See Helen P. Gouldner and others, *The Natural History of the Education of the Black Child in the City,* 1971, (ERIC ED 061 395) and the following items by Ray C. Rist, Jr.: *The Socialization of the Ghetto Child into the Urban School System* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1970); "The Milieu of a Ghetto School as a Precipitator of Educational Failure," *Phylon,* 33 (Winter 1972) 348-360; *The Urban School. A Factory for Failure—An Ethnographic Study of Education in American Society* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1973).

[122] Kenneth B. Clark, "Issues in Urban Education," p. 79 in Haskins, *Black Manifesto for Education.*

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

[124] Bindman, *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University,* p. 193.

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

[126] J. Don Boney, "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," *Journal of Negro Education,* Summer 1967.

[127] *Ibid., pp. 318-319.*

[128] Helton, *Characteristics, Performance, Problems, and Successes of Negro Graduate Students,* pp. 85 and 104.

[129] Educational Testing Service, *Invitational Papers Submitted to the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives,* March 1971, p. 69 (ERIC ED 051 314).

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 70.

[131] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[132] David M. Rafky, *Race Relations in Higher Education,* 2 vols., 1972, p. 66 (ERIC ED 060 773).

[133] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[134] Solomon Cytrynbam, *Race of Teacher, Task and Affective Interaction in Southern Black College Classes* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971), p. 381.

[135] T. Bentley Edwards, "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation," *Journal of Experimental Education,* Winter 1966, p. 85.

[136] *Ibid.*

[137] Norman E. Zinberg, "A Group Approach with the Integration Crisis," *Mental Hygiene* (April 1967).

[138] *Ibid.*, pp. 297-298.

[139] John Edward Gordon, Jr., *The Effects on White Student Teachers of Value Clarification Interviews with Negro Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1965) (University Microfilms); Leo Baron Hicks, Sr., *Apprentice Teaching and Exposure to Additional Information on Methods of Attitude Modification in Negro Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 67-11,864); Harry L. Miller, "The Relation of Social Class to Slum School Attitudes Among Education Students in an Urban College," *Journal of Teacher Education,* 19 (1968) 416-424.

[140] Mark A. Chesler, "Interaction and Teaching Alternatives in Desegregated Classrooms," pp. 90-125, *Racial Crisis in American Education,* ed. by Robert Lee Green, (Chicago: Follett, 1969); Mark A. Chesler, Judith Guskin, and Phyllis Erenberg, *Planning Educational Change,* Vol. II: *Human Resources in School Desegregation* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969); Paul C. Goldin, "A Model for Racial Awareness Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools," *Integrated Education,* 8 (1970) 62-64; Jonathan Jackson and David Kirkpatrick, *A Report: Institute for the Preparation of Counselors and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership in Desegregated Schools,* November 1967 (ERIC # ED 020 557); Harold T. Johnson and Harold L. Tyler, *Special Training Institute on Desegregation for Educational Systems of the First District of Georgia,* October 30, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 684); Bernard C. Kinnick and Stanton D. Platter, "Attitudinal Change Toward Negroes and School Desegregation Among Participants in a Summer Training Institute," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 73 (1967); Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana, *Improving Quality During School Desegregation,* February 1969 (ERIC # ED 029 363); Wilson Record, "The White Professional Educators and the Black Ghetto Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (1970) 44-49; and Staten W. Webster and Nathaniel Pugh, *The Team Approach to Solving Problems of Desegregation and the Disadvantaged Student in the Oakland Public Schools,* April 26, 1967 (ERIC # ED 030 701).

[141] See, for example, Marjorie McDonald, *Not by the the Color of Their Skin, The Impact of Racial Differences on the Child's Development* (New York: International Universities Press, 1970) p. 28; Katherine B. Baxter, Jane R. Cosby, and Frances M. May, "What We've Been Through Is the Introduction," *Integrated Education,* 11 (November-December 1974), pp. 28-31; and Herbert L. Foster, *Ribbin' Jivin', and Playin' the Dozens. The Unrecognized Dilemma of Inner City Schools* (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1974).

CHAPTER 10
THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND THE SCHOOLS

In 1883 the following statement appeared in a leading black newspaper, the *New York Globe:*

> We want absolute equality in the public schools–mixed scholars and mixed teachers–and if we can't have it, we want colored schools taught by colored teachers . . . Show us one black president of a white college in this broad land; show us one black professor in any white college in this country. . . .On the other hand, we have white presidents of black colleges . . . and white professors in black colleges by the hundreds. . . . Who has drawn this line? Certainly *we* have not.[1]

The *Globe* thereby expressed several basic black viewpoints which endure into our own day.

First, was the emphasis on equality linked immediately with the existence of nonsegregated schools. Second, and just as characteristically, however, was a readiness to accept separate schools if no other alternative existed. Black parents could not afford to dally over empty principles. As historian Quarles noted in contrasting black with white abolitionists before the Civil War: "Negro abolitionists . . . had no fondness for abstraction. Their interest was more personal."[2] Third, was an intense conciousness of discrimination. The universality of the color line in the schools–"from the Pacific to the swamps of Alabama"–strengthened feelings among blacks of a common national experience. Fourth, was a clear denial that blacks were responsible for racial separation. The color line was drawn by white society.

The general poverty of blacks meant that educational opportunity for their children depended on access to public schools.[3] Neither churches nor other private groups ever provided more than marginal schooling for blacks as a whole. As noted in chapters 1 and 2, however, the public school doors were closely guarded against minority children. Consequently, organized protest activity by black parents became a standing feature of black community life. These activities involved lawsuits, school boycotts, demonstrations, and legislative lobbying.[4] White allies were important, if rare; in some localities their cooperation was indispensable. The foundation stone of the movement for school equality remained the black community, acting in its various states of organization and disorganization.

The contemporary black movement for human rights is historic in several respects. It is (1) national, (2) made up largely of blacks, and (3) led by blacks. Yet, little appears in the social science literature about the black community background of the movement for equal educational opportunity. Community and public opinion studies of desegregation, for example, most often refer to white communities and attitudes. Blacks are viewed as objects of study rather than as initiators of action.

In this chapter, the focus is on blacks as individuals concerned with the education of their children and on the efforts of blacks to achieve a more inclusive school system. Evidence contained in national public opinion polls is reported, followed by a review of the more extensive research on attitudes and actions in localities. Several aspects of the black urban community are explored. The participation of black parents in school affairs is examined in a few specific cities.

The last major section of the chapter is devoted to an analysis of empirical materials on community control of schools.

ATTITUDES AND ACTIONS

In every society, certain practices widely acknowledged as immoral constitute an incessant subject of conversation while the practices endure. Frederick Douglass, before the Civil War, called slavery the American people's favorite monster. Despite the daily condemnation in the North of the practice of slavery, those who advocated putting an end to it were frequently denounced as extremists.

Today, public opinion polling enables the measurement of community attitudes with unprecedented exactness. But it has not resolved the persistent problem of relating attitude to action. Since the early 1960's or so, popular condemnation of racial discrimination has grown to a majority viewpoint. At the same time, resistance to specific measures to reduce or eliminate discrimination in education has by no means disappeared.

Large-scale, long-term shifts in public opinion should not be regarded as merely altered verbalizations without changes in social practice. These shifts reflect a myriad of changes in individual orientation and behavior. To policy-makers, the shifts create imperatives and goals for new approaches through legislation, for example. Most important, perhaps, the shifts often reflect the pressure of historic forces as, for instance, when millions of minority people, who have gained a new consciousness of their common problems, express an unaccustomed organized determination to solve their problems. Such forces also influence persons who stand outside the circle of the aggrieved.

Public opinion is most often gauged by findings from national polls. Such surveys have at least one weakness with respect to education: while opinions about schools are measured nationally, children attend school locally. National polls may probe attitudes rather abstractly. Yet, the critical opinions regard issues on the local level. In a national poll, for example, an individual may approve whatever policies are needed to achieve desegregation. At the same time, that person might resist rezoning or busing in his or her home city, even though these actions could be the only means of achieving desegregation in the community. To gauge the opinion of blacks, local polls are even more important. Local opinion surveys more likely reflect actual conflict situations which may be resolved in favor of desegregation.

Before the advent of public opinion polling, the assessment of popular attitudes was inferred from social actions engaged in by various persons. Thus, in the absence of public opinion polls, even the least sophisticated observer could "read" the meaning of blacks in Montgomery, Ala. engaging in a protracted bus boycott in 1955. Similarly, the meaning of school boycotts during 1963-65 by millions of blacks in the North and South was clear, even if the demonstrators were not asked for their personal opinions on the grievances that led to the action. Therefore, in this chapter it is important to go beyond the polls to evaluate the significance of concrete actions in black communities.

Special emphasis is laid upon opinions and actions among blacks not in derogation of developments among whites. Rather, an attempt is made to counter the stereotype of the black community as merely an inert, passive object of white opinion and actions. Despite the tidal wave of scholarly and other literature on Negro Americans, this stereotype retains its unfortunate vitality.

NATIONAL POLLS

National opinion surveys on desegregation are far from uniform, even within the same polling organization. In many surveys busing and desegregation have been equated. During 1970-74, polls were taken by three different organizations: Gallup, Harris, and National Opinion Research Center (NORC).

Gallup queried a national sample of the voting-age population three times during these years. Respondents were asked whether they supported busing school children to achieve integration or racial balance. Results in percentages were as follows:

	YES (percent)
March 1970	
White	11
Non-white	37

August 1971	
White	15
Non-white	45
October 1974	
White	28
Non-white	75

Harris conducted two surveys during 1970-72. Following are the results, in percentages:

	Favor (percent)	Oppose (percent)	Not sure (percent)
Mid-1970			
White	16	77	7
Black	46	40	14
April 1972			
White	17	78	5
Black	52	34	14

NORC conducted two surveys of busing sentiment in 1972-74. Findings of opinions *against* busing were as follows:

	Oppose (percent)
1972	
White	86
Black	45
1974	
White	86
Black	37

The surveys as a whole document clearly two major trends: (1) black support for busing grew significantly while opposition declined; and (2) white support also increased although opposition remained the view of a definite majority of whites. Several additional points should be noted. When responses are reported for non-whites rather than blacks, the effect is to understate black support and overstate black opposition. Blacks as a whole are, for example, much stronger supporters of busing than Asian Americans; yet, both groups are non-white. (In 1973, blacks constituted 89.3 percent of non-whites.) In addition, the use of the term "racial balance" as a synonym for "desegregation" probably tilts the poll against busing. Desegregation is a constitutional obligation while racial balance pursues a precarious career in courts and legislatures. Finally, certain unexplained inconsistencies exist among the three polls. For example, in 1974 Gallup reported 28 percent of whites favored busing. At the same time, NORC found 86 percent of whites to be opposed to busing. There are just not enough whites to accommodate both findings simultaneously!

A fundamental problem that bedevils any would-be interpreter of public opinion polls is the extent of knowledge that lies behind individual expressions of opinion. Customarily, this is treated simply as an unknown. In November-December 1972, however, NORC conducted a survey designed to ascertain the relationship of opinions on busing to degree of knowledge. Six factual-type, true-false questions about desegregation and busing were asked of a national adult sample. Persons who answered four to six questions correctly were regarded as moderately to well-informed; from two to three questions, as informed only to a limited extent; and one or no questions, substantially misinformed.

Non-whites were better informed than whites, as the following indicates, in percentages:[5]

Number of correct answers

	Total public	0-1	2-3	4-6
White	90	95	86	88
Non-white	10	5	14	12

In general, proponents of busing were better informed than opponents. The areas of knowledge included the effects of desegregation on white academic achievement and the effect of busing on the ability of children to learn.

Is it possible to arrive at a numerical conception of adherents of busing? Applying the Gallup finding of October, 1974 to a national total of 137 million persons 18 years and older, it would appear that opponents of busing may have outnumbered proponents by 89 million to 48 million. Since the total number of non-whites of the same age-group was only 15.4 million, more than two-thirds of the probusing group consisted of whites. This is probably contrary to a widespread impression. A notable aspect of the predominantly white character of probusing is its strengthening during 1970-74 when the issue of busing became highly politicized.

LOCAL POLLS

During Spring and Summer 1965, Smith and associates polled a Negro sample in metropolitan Detroit.[6] When asked "would you say the racial integration of schools is moving [at a certain pace]?" responses were grouped as in the table which follows.[7]

Negro Views on Pace of School Desegregation in Detroit Area

	Non-members of any formal association percent	Holders of a single membership percent	Holders of a plural membership percent
Too rapidly	9	6	2
About right	37	41	33
Too slowly	45	44	65
Don't know	9	9	0

In the Dumbarton study of Oakland, Negro high school graduates in the sample felt that "the Negro child would be better off in a school with white children (94 percent) and the majority (64 percent) regard integration as no hardship on the Negro child even if he is but one of a few in the school."[8] Of the graduates who had attended desegregated schools, 81 percent were willing for their own children to be sent out of the neighborhood; only 55 percent of those who had attended segregated schools agreed.[9]

Pettigrew reported that desegregation tended to become self-perpetuating. Once having attended desegregated schools, both Negroes and whites were willing to send their own children to such schools; and they more readily advocated desegregation as a principle. It is important to note that this finding held even with respondents who presently lived in segregated housing.

Krystall, Chesler, and White in February, June, and November of 1966 studied the Negro community in Montgomery, Ala.[10] Parents numbering 127 were interviewed; they had 252 children in school. Only four of these children (1.6 percent) were enrolled in desegregated public schools.[11] Only a third of the parents believed Negro schools were at least as good as white schools; over half (55 percent) believed Negro schools were inferior. Yet, nearly all the parents (96 percent) expressed satisfaction with their children's schooling. The researchers had no explanation for this seeming contradiction.

In March 1966, a Federal court directed the Montgomery school board to install a free choice enrollment system. Very few Negro parents applied to have their children transfered. While many indicated at one time or another their intention to register their children, it was found that 80 percent had not considered seriously the possibility of sending their children to an all-white school.[12] At the same time, nearly as many (71 percent) approved of the principle of desegregated schools. The following table reveals some of the reasoning behind the hesitancy of Negro parents.[13]

The increasing salience of black nationalist ideology may also help explain the hesitancy to desegregate, although the researchers do not offer this explanation. Later in 1964, Marx polled a national sample of Negroes with this question: "If the United States got into a war today, would you personally feel this country was worth fighting for, or not?" "Yes", said 91 percent of Marx's Birmingham sample.[14] Almost 2 years later, in the study by Krystall and associates, Montgomery adult Negroes were asked to agree to disagree with this statement: "Negroes who are denied first class citizenship here in the U.S. should not go and fight for the U.S. in some foreign country." Grouping the replies of registered voters[15] by whether they

Advantages and Disadvantages of Going to a White School,
According to Negro Parents in Montgomery, Ala.

Advantages	Percent	Disadvantages	Percent
Children learn more	23	Adjust to new school	15
Wider subject choice	6	No white friends	18
Better facilities and equipment	28	Harm from whites	22
More attention from teachers	5	Transportation	8
White schools better; equal education	8	Don't know	37
Don't know	30		

registered originally before or after passage of the 1965 Federal Voting Rights Act, here is how they responded:[16]

	Agree (percent)	Disagree (percent)
Registered before 1965	48	62
Registered after 1965	52	38

If a degree of likeness exists between the Negro people in Birmingham and Montgomery, the later study shows a sharp rise in black nationalist sentiment.

During the first half of 1967, Passow directed a comprehensive survey of the District of Columbia public school system.[17] Negro children accounted for more than 90 percent of the enrollment. Nevertheless, 58 percent of Negro parents wanted to desegregate the schools; only 26 percent favored upgrading the segregated schools; corresponding percentages for white parents were 26 and 48.[18] Here is a summary of survey results on three questions asked of Negro and white parents.[19]

Parents' positions on integration and the use of busing, and
creation of metropolitan school district to enhance integration in the
District of Columbia, 1967

	Total (percent)	Negro (percent)	White (percent)
Position on integration			
Favor integrated schools	49	58	26
Improve segregated schools	33	27	48
Not sure	18	15	26
Busing			
Favor	38	45	21
Oppose	50	41	69
Not sure	12	14	10
Metropolitan school district			
Favor	29	34	19
Oppose	54	49	67
Not sure	17	17	14

Community leaders, according to Passow, do not share the Negro parents' dedication to integration: "Most leaders interviewed seem to have abandoned their hope of integrating the public schools in Washington, D.C."[20]

Spiegel led a study of civic violence in six large cities: Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Akron, San Francisco, and Boston.[21] He found great impatience among Negroes at the slow progress of desegregation.

A study of civil rights in Chicago was made during the summer of 1967.[22] Among Negro respondents 93 percent favored integrated schools. Negro and white respondents were asked: "How about you? Are you less in favor of rapid integration or more strongly in favor of rapid integration than you were a year ago?" Responses were as follows:[23]

Response	Negro percent	White percent
Less in favor	9.4	50.1
About the same	32.6	34.9
More in favor	58.0	15.0

The researchers reported: "Our data suggest that . . . it is not only adequate schools but integrated schools . . . to which Negroes aspire. . . . There is absolutely no indication in these data that a northern version of 'separate but equal' facilities and housing will be accepted by the growing Negro middle class."[24]

The Chicago researchers constructed a civil rights index and a militance of action index; the former is a measure of opinion on a range of public issues; the latter, on orientation toward social action. The following table classifies the response given to a question about schools in Chicago. Fewer than 41 percent of the Negro respondents think the schools are good; the more dissatisfied they are with schools, the more devoted on civil rights issues and the more militant in tactics. A number of significant interrelations can be found among the responses within each racial group as well as between the groups.

Perhaps most significant is the fact that the summer of 1967, was–for Chicago–mild civil rights weather. There were virtually no public demonstrations or marches and the public school system had receded temporarily from public view

Civil Rights Attitudes
in Chicago
1967

CIVIL RIGHTS INDEX

How would you rate the public schools in this neighborhood?		Percent distribution	Full acceptance	Open occupancy	School Integration	Equal employment & facilities	Total number
White							
	Good	65.4	35.9	41.5	12.8	9.8	686
	Fair	10.4	42.9	30.4	11.6	15.2	112
	Poor	3.8	39.0	31.7	14.6	14.6	41
	Don't know	20.4	36.0	38.3	15.9	9.8	214
Negro							
	Good	40.8	71.1	23.6	3.9	1.4	280
	Fair	24.6	72.8	23.7	2.9	0.6	173
	Poor	12.2	86.7	10.8	2.4	0.0	83
	Don't know	22.4	63.9	29.7	3.2	3.2	155

MILITANCE OF ACTION INDEX

		Pro-Action		Neutral	Anti-Action		
		Strong	Moderate		Strong	Moderate	Total Number
White							
	Good	1.1	25.7	7.6	36.6	29.0	708
	Fair	5.3	22.1	8.0	37.2	27.4	113
	Poor	2.4	34.1	4.9	36.6	22.0	41
	Don't know	2.3	20.8	10.4	40.7	25.8	221
Negro							
	Good	20.2	76.0	2.8	1.0	0.0	287
	Fair	31.2	63.6	1.2	3.5	0.6	173
	Poor	39.5	57.0	2.3	1.2	0.0	86
	Don't know	19.6	74.1	2.5	3.8	0.0	158

as an issue of contention. Civil rights organizations were experiencing large losses in support. Yet, Negro dedication to school integration grew. Hardly less significant was the further fact that Negro devotion to integration did not suffer in the face of black nationalist endeavors.

Between April and October 1966, Negro and white adults in four Connecticut cities were interviewed on a broad range of urban problems. Questions relating to housing integration elicited an overwhelmingly affirmative opinion from the Negro respondents.[25] On school desegregation matters, Negroes were far more willing than whites to accept measures such as busing and cross-busing. The following table reports some of these results.[26]

Negro and white opinion on proposal to bus Negro children to schools in white neighborhoods, four Connecticut cities, 1966 by percent

	Bridgeport		Hartford		New Haven		Waterbury	
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro
	percent		percent		percent		percent	
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agree	19.0	30.7	24.3	59.3	19.1	45.5	17.5	29.6
Disagree	69.2	24.0	62.4	24.4	67.1	36.4	70.4	56.3
Mix, both agree and disagree	5.0	40.0	5.9	9.8	6.4	14.0	5.5	5.9
Don't know	6.8	5.3	7.5	6.5	7.5	4.0	6.5	8.1
N =	516	75	510	123	425	99	382	135

Negro and white opinion
on proposal to bus white children to schools in Negro
neighborhoods, four Connecticut cities, 1966, by percent

Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agree	14.7	33.3	14.7	55.3	13.9	43.4	22.8	45.2
Disagree	76.4	25.3	74.5	27.6	76.5	40.4	62.8	44.4
Mix, both agree and disagree	3.1	38.7	4.3	9.8	5.2	12.1	6.3	6.7
Don't know	5.8	2.7	6.5	7.3	4.5	4.0	8.1	3.7
N	516	75	510	123	425	99	382	135

When asked to indicate whether they considered integration of schools and housing important or not important, 79 percent and 82 percent respectively, thought these were important.[28] On the other hand, both matters were ranked rather low as community priorities, quite far behind economic opportunities, better housing, and new schools.

During the summer of 1967, residents of the Bedfore-Stuyvesant section of Central Brooklyn, N.Y., received special training and conducted a public opinion survey of their area; the project was supervised by the Center for Urban Education. Attitudes toward segregation-integration were probed. Respondents were asked if they thought it possible for a child to get a good education in a school attended only by Negro and Puerto Rican children. Answers were as follows, by percentages:[27]

	Number	Yes, possible	No, not possible	Don't know
Negro	2,528	40	41	19
White	137	46	28	26
Puerto Ricans	228	54	24	22

In 1966, the Evanston, Ill., school board began exploring the possibility of a desegregation plan. Busing was proposed but those to be bused would be mainly black children. School district personnel conducted a door-to-door canvass of Negro citizens whose children were to be bused. "Most of the parents surveyed," according to Thomas, "said that they did not oppose busing if it would achieve school desegregation and ultimate integration."[29] In time, the proportion of black to white children bused became more equitable.

During 1971-72, parents in 17 southern school districts responded to two questions regarding their views of desegregation as follows, in percentages:[30]

	Minority parents percent	Non-minority parents percent
1. Feeling about your children attending a desegregated school		
Pleased	59	19
Didn't care	21	26
Worried	20	55
2. Desegregation process		
Very easy	15	6
Easy	53	38
Difficult	27	37
Very difficult	5	19

While the contrast between both groups is expected, the responses as a whole may be technically unrepresentative since there was only a 16 percent response rate.

In Los Angeles County during 1971, the Survey Research Center of the University of California, Los Angeles polled a representative sample. While 75 percent favored desegregation, 69 percent opposed busing as a means of achieving it. Those favoring the use of busing were as follows:[31]

Whites	15 percent
Mexican Americans	37 do.
Blacks	57 do.

Pollsters noted that the wealthier and more educated the respondents, the greater the opposition to busing. (This was also true in the national Gallup poll of October 1974.)

After the first year of court-ordered desegregation in San Francisco, parents were polled. The effect of the desegregation program as a whole was rated either "very good" or "good" as follows:[32]

Black	46.4 percent
Spanish-speaking	24.4 do.
Other white	23.2 do.
Chinese	8.7 do.

With reference to busing, parents responded on the aspect of safety:[33]

	Spanish speaking	Other white	Black	Chinese
No problem	34.6 percent	36.7 percent	49.8 percent	20.6 percent
Few problems	35.7 do.	44.2 do.	37.7 do.	40.5 do.
Many problems	17.4 do.	14.2 do.	6.8 do.	23.9 do.

On the same question, differences in experience were evident between parents whose children had been bused and parents whose children were not bused but who had formed secondhand impressions. Findings were as follows:[34]

	Non-bused	Bused
No problem	20.2 percent	37.7 percent
Few problems	29.8 do.	41.3 do.
Many problems	19.3 do.	13.4 do.

All in all, blacks were the most receptive to desegregation and experienced the least concern regarding safety problems.

Between 1967 and 1971, blacks in Detroit became more conditional in their support of integration while whites tended to strengthen their support. Aberbach and Walker asked representative samples during 1967 and 1971: "Speaking in general terms, do you favor racial integration, total separation of races, or something in between?"[35] Persons in the sample were also questioned specifically about schools attitudes toward integration. Between the two dates, black support for school integration fell from 96 to 88 percent, while black support for segregated schools rose from 2 to 8 percent. ("Don't know" increased from 2 to 4 percent.) A large number of black proponents of school integration, however, became disenchanted with demonstrations as a way of achieving integrated schools. Detroit whites, meanwhile, increased their choice of segregated schools from 30 to 34 percent while the percentage favoring integrated schools fell from 70 to 59. ("Don't know" increased from 1 to 7 percent.)

	Whites percent		Blacks percent	
	1967	1971	1967	1971
Integration	18	27	88	68
In between	57	54	11	29
Separation	17	17	1	3
Don't know	2	2	0	0

The next year, 1972, the *Detroit Free Press* surveyed 1,078 adults in Oakland, Macomb, and Wayne counties, Mich. (Detroit is in Wayne county.) Blacks proved to know accurately the busing views of whites. On the other hand, whites were poorly informed on black views of busing. Respondents were asked whether they would mind if their child were bused for several miles in order to attend a school of preferred racial composition. Responses by percentages were as follows:[36]

	Mind a lot	Mind a little	Mind not at all
Blacks in Detroit	17 percent	28 percent	55 percent
Whites in suburbs	58 do.	15 do.	25 do.

About three quarters of blacks--all but a few in Detroit–felt school integration had a positive effect on the quality of education whereas some two-thirds of whites thought it had no such effect. U.S. District Judge Stephen Roth had recently issued a desegregation order that might involve, ultimately, busing among the three counties in which the polling occurred. Respondents were asked whether they approved of the ruling and affirmatively responded as follows, in percentages:[37]

Suburbanites	5
Detroit whites	7
Detroit blacks	59

More blacks reported they had moved closer to a goal of integration than away from it.

In 1971, the Texas Poll queried a statewide representative sample: "In order to bring about racial balance in the public schools, the Federal Government wants children to be taken by bus to other schools in the community if schools in the neighborhoods are not racially mixed. Do you approve or disapprove of this way of bringing about school integration?" Responses, in percentages, were as follows: [37]

	For	Against	Undecided
Blacks	50	36	14
Mexican Americans	37	55	8
Whites	6	89	5

Between 1963 and 1971, the percent of whites in Texas who were willing to send their children to schools with blacks rose from 41 to 73.

In 1973, pollsters in Dayton, Ohio asked a sample of 339 persons what their reaction would be "should forced busing become a reality?"[38]

	Whites	Blacks
Would comply because needed for better education	14 percent	52 percent
Would comply reluctantly	15 do.	25 do.
Would comply but do not feel it is right	15 do.	6 do.
Would not comply	54 do.	13 do.
Other	2 do.	4 do.

Thus, 83 percent of blacks and 44 percent of whites thought they would comply, whatever their reasons.

The Decision Research Corporation conducted a survey in Boston of desegregation and busing during April 5-15, 1974 for the *Boston Globe*. Two-thirds of the blacks felt their children would receive a better education in a racially balanced than in an all-black school. Within the city proper, respondents were asked what they thought of busing some black and white children to avoid attending a heavily black school. Responses were as follows, by percentages: [39]

	For	Against	Conditional approval	No opinion
Total Boston	29	63	7	1
Whites	25	68	6	1
Blacks	57	27	8	8
Spanish-speaking	37	49	5	9

In several other respects, black opinion was strongly in favor of desegregation.

Less than 6 months later, implementation of a Federal court desegregation order was met by great community disorder, some of it organized. During these events, many opponents of the desegregation order held that "liberals" in the city's suburbs were intent on installing a busing program in Boston while opposing it in the suburbs. Data in the *Globe* poll of April 1974 do not support this view. As the poll found: "In the city, self-identified liberals opposed busing of their children 54-40 percent, while in the suburbs the margin opposed is 49-39 percent."[40] When asked whether they favored repeal of a State law requiring racially balanced schools, Boston and its suburbs did not demonstrate sharply different views. This is illustrated by the following responses:[41]

	For	Against	No opinion
Total Boston	54 percent	36 percent	10 percent
Total suburbs	46 do.	39 do.	15 do.

By contrast a majority of blacks opposed repeal.

A special Gallup survey was conducted in Omaha, Neb. during July 1974. The survey report noted that "while busing is disliked by many blacks, many are willing to accept it if this would further their educational goals." In other words, busing was viewed instrumentally, not as a matter of principle. The Ohio Poll questioned a statewide sample during the summer of 1974. Responses on the desirability of integration varied sharply according to whether or not mandatory busing was the means utilized. Here are selected responses, by percentages:[42]

	Integration without busing		Integration with busing	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Respondents				
Whites	74	17	18	74
Blacks	78	14	62	36

Clearly, a large majority of blacks favored integration, with or without busing. Whites, on the other hand, tended to match the enthusiasm of blacks for integration in the abstract. They parted ways, however, in the presence of busing. A statewide poll in Delaware, conducted by the Division of Urban Affairs of the University of Delaware, revealed 53 percent of blacks opposed to busing; 87 percent of whites were also opposed. An official of the Wilmington NAACP suggested blacks in that State would favor busing only if both black and white children would be bused to and from Wilmington schools which are largely black.[43]

Since 1965, local public opinion polls from a number of cities and States leave little doubt of continuing black community support for a policy of integrated schools. This commitment is far more emphatic in local than in national polls. In the face of the continuing national debate on busing, black opinion has become even more receptive to busing. White opinion has followed the same trend, although on a smaller scale.

LOCAL ACTIONS

Historically, black communities have participated eagerly in the movement for desegregation of schools. On the heels of the *Brown* decision (1954 and 1955), black parents in the Deep South applied to boards of education for the right to send their children to nonsegregated schools. That they were rebuffed virtually everywhere did not lessen their interest. Community action took the form of lawsuits, public meetings and demonstrations, gatherings to support Negro children enrolled in desegregated schools, public appeals to black parents to enroll their children in desegregated schools, sermons which had heavy political components, and voter registration drives and campaigning.

The 1960's were a time of demonstrations by black communities the country over. Following is an incomplete compilation of demonstrative events during 1965-1969 on behalf of desegregation, led in the majority of cases by local blacks:[44]

Place	Action
New York, N.Y.	School boycott
Teaneck, N.J.	School board elections
Trenton, N.J.	Demonstration on behalf of Chester movement for integration
Evanston, Ill.	NAACP threat to help defeat bond issue
Houston, Tex.	School boycott
Tipton County, Tenn.	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisc.	Picket line
Springfield, Mass.	Sit-in, school board office
Boston, Mass.	Sit-in at school
Philadelphia, Pa.	Picketing of school
Chicago, Ill.	School boycott
St. Paul, Minn.	Picketing of school board
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Picketing of school board
Crawfordville, Ga.	Demonstration
Washington, Ga.	Demonstration
Bogalusa, La.	School boycott
Huntsville, Tex.	Demonstration
Natchez, Miss.	Boycott of stores
Lincolnton, Ga.	School boycott
Milwaukee, Wisc.	School boycott
Riverside, Calif.	School boycott
Bridgeport, Conn.	Demonstration
Milwaukee, Wisc.	Picketing of construction site
Tuscaloosa, Ala.	School boycott
Atlantic City, N.J.	Picketing of school board
Englewood, N.J.	Unauthorized group registration at white school
Laverne, Ala.	School boycott
Natchez, Miss.	Citywide school boycott
Lorman, Miss.	Demonstration by students
Cordele, Ga.	Demonstration by students
Jacksonville, Fla.	Picketing of school board
Seattle, Wash.	School boycott
Detroit, Mich.	School boycott
Englewood, N.J.	Parent demonstrations
Phoenix-South Holland, Ill.	School boycott
Grenada, Miss.	Demonstration
Woodville, Miss.	Demonstration
Peoria, Ill.	Sit-in at school board office
Providence, R.I.	Demonstration
Fayette, Miss.	Boycott of stores
Jacksonville, Fla.	School boycott
Oakland, Calif.	School boycott
Grenada, Miss.	School boycott
Port Gibson, Miss.	Boycott of stores
Menlo Park, Calif.	Picketing of school
Maywood, Ill.	Demonstration
District of Columbia	Boycott of schools
Toledo, Ohio	Boycott of schools
Lexington, Ky.	Demonstration
Wadesboro, N.C.	Boycott of school
Benton Harbor, Mich.	NAACP helped defeat bond issue

Gary, Ind.	School boycott
Buffalo, N.Y.	Demonstration
Hillsborough, N.C.	Boycott
Waycross, Ga.	Boycott
Swan Quarter, N.C.	Boycott
Sylvester, Ga.	Demonstration
West Palm Beach, Fla.	Demonstration
Charlotte, N.C.	Demonstration
Austin, Tex.	Demonstration
Fulton County, Ga.	Boycott
Memphis, Tenn.	Boycotts and demonstrations
Gainesville, Fla.	Boycott
Rochester, N.Y.	Boycott and demonstrations

While the central object of the actions was desegregation, differences within the black community affected the manner in which the goal was sought. In Chicago, for example, Rivera, McWorter, and Lilliensten studied social class factors in two large-scale school boycotts in Chicago.[45] In tracing those Negro parents who had supported the first boycott in October 1963, but "defected" from the second in February 1964, Rivera and associates explained:

> Those who shifted from a pro- to an anti-boycott stand . . . were disproportionately persons of higher educational attainment. These figures imply a challenge to at least one widely held assumption concerning the values of middle class Negroes: that such persons attach overriding importance to the principle of desegregated public school facilities . . . [Defectors] tend to stress the *quality* of their children's education over the number of whites who happen to be enrolled in neighborhood schools.[46]

The October boycott had drawn 224,000 Negro students while the February boycott drew 172,000.[47] The largest differences in participation were found in middle class Negro areas. In New York City, similar forces were at work. As the civil rights conflict grew more heated, the established organizations tended to avoid disruptive techniques such as mass boycotts.[48]

In a number of smaller cities, organized blacks played significant roles in pressing school boards to move toward desegregation. In Sacramento, Calif., when a heavily-minority junior high school burned down, the NAACP and CORE demanded that no new school be built at the same site.[49] In Evanston, Ill., black parents of children attending a virtually all-black elementary school were adamant. "Their meetings with . . . official bodies," wrote Thomas, "were often heated and on several occasions threats were made to physically damage Foster School if it were not eliminated as a segregated school."[50] Once desegregation plans were adopted, the community at large tended to forget the critical role of organized blacks in generating a movement for such plans. In any event, black community action of this sort added an indispensable element of urgency, at a minimum.

Once desegregation began, two avenues of black community action emerged. Continuing political support was important. In Pasadena, Calif., desegregation became a reality as a result of a Federal court order. When the school board majority failed to appeal that order to a higher court, local opponents of desegregation challenged the board incumbents to a recall election. In 1970, the three incumbents won reelection by margins of 52, 54, and 56 percent. Voter turnout was 63 percent among blacks but only 50 percent among whites. Black votes were crucial to the outcome.[51] Blacks in Evanston, Ill., organized a strong electoral campaign to elect school board members sympathetic to the superintendent who had administered a desegregation program. While the effort failed, the pro-desegregation sentiments of the black community were clear.[52]

A second avenue of black community action involves influencing events within the schools themselves. In Glynn County (Brunswick), Ga., desegregation was announced by the school board as requiring a reduction in the number of black principals. After black community efforts, in cooperation with State officers of NAACP, no black principal was discharged.[53] Black and white parents in Escambia County (Pensacola), Fla., formed an interracial advisory committee which, according to U.S. Commission on Civil Rights observers, helped make Washington High School outstanding. A majority-black desegregated school, the observers reported, Washington was said to have "strong and fair leadership . . . and general good relationships among students."[54] In Alachua County (Gainesville), Fla., "white and black parents serve as bus monitors, ride to designated schools, serve as aides, providing assistance to teachers and staff."[55]

Since in numerous southern communities blacks on school boards are rare, black community political organizations have concentraed on electing black school board members. In 1975 the latter represented the single largest group of elected black public officials. Their importance in absolute numbers, however, is still rather small. An added source of black-community influence, North as well as South, emerges from the growing practice of Federal courts to include provisions for a biethnic or triethnic citizens, committee in original desegregation orders. These groups are accountable directly to the judge. Conflicts are not uncommon between the committees and the elected school boards. While the committees are advisory, the span of their interest is extremely broad, encompassing curriculum, teacher-employment, student discipline, and other day-to-day matters.[56]

It has rightly been said that politics is the name of the civil rights movement of the 1970's. The streets are now used more for walking than marching. But the arena of action has simply shifted, not disappeared. In numerous black communities citizens have access to more official structures than ever before.[57] Where outright political power has been won through elections of black officials or where blacks have become part of a broader political coalition, black influence is more palpable. In desegregated schools generally, blacks have more rights, and for the most part, exercise more rights in the education of their children than under segregation. Many of the remaining shortcomings are attributed to factors that antedate the advent of desegregation.

One of the clearest conclusions to be drawn from the evidence of black action for desegregation is that typically blacks have not depended upon whites to establish and consolidate desegregated schools.

THE BLACK URBAN COMMUNITY

"The school," writes Ritterband, "is analogous to a well charted island, while the community is the sea around it. Our knowledge of this sea is necessarily much more fragmentary,"[53] In part, however, this ignorance stems from inattention to what is already known. Another factor at work is a tendency to treat black communities as socially homogeneous and as uniform in character.

Black communities share one common feature—they are segregated. DuBois described their segregated condition in southern cities as long ago as 1900. In the northern cities, segregation is characteristic. Rose has studied the growth of the black ghetto in Milwaukee. Over any extended period of years, he observes, blacks and whites never compete in a common housing market.[59] Darden analyzed the development of housing segregation in Pittsburgh, exploring, as well, deliberate techniques of the real estate industry to enforce the segregation.[60] The development of residential segregation facilitates the creation of segregated schools. Segregation of housing and of schools constitutes an expression of a larger social pattern of external restriction of life chances of persons living under ghetto conditions.

Harrison has found the same restriction to operate even in the case of government-sponsored employment opportunities within poverty areas which are often also segregated areas. In 1971 he studied occupants of jobs opened as a result of the model cities program. According to the law, local residents were to be preferred. Harrison discovered, however, that "fewer than half of all the jobs in the program were held by ghetto residents."[61] Ghetto participation was lowest in those categories of jobs requiring special training, as might be expected. Racial discrimination also seemed to be operating against minorities. Thus, a special program designed to provide employment of ghetto residents was used in large part to benefit persons living outside the ghetto. Harrison observes that employment of ghetto residents in the program rose in places where black political power was present or potentially present.[62]

As shown earlier, chapter 7, pages 24-25, during the 1960's black educational advances were considerable. In turn, improvements in educational achievements helped narrow the black-white occupational gap. Thus, as Welch reports, "viewed as a proportional contribution to earnings, returns to schooling have increased for blacks relative to whites."[63] At the same time, Weiss and Williamson found that South-North differences in the quality of education received by blacks have all but disappeared. Southern-educated black youths are not at a disadvantage in finding jobs up North. Rather, declare Weiss and Williamson, the young northern ghetto-educated black suffers the competitive disadvantage.[64]

To what extent have the educational-occupational advances affected the economic fortunes of adult black men? Between 1962 and 1972, according to Hauser and Featherman, black men of ages 35 to 64 who were in the labor force improved their occupational status. (This change had nothing to do with educational shifts.) At the same time many uncounted adult male blacks left the labor force as they abandoned hope of finding regular employment. In 1972, as in 1962, "the source of black-white differentials in achievement is not primarily the greater relevance of impoverished origins among blacks, but the cumulative effects of discrimination by race at every stage of a man's life."[65]

Social relations in the ghetto are often misperceived by researchers. Coleman speaks of "the low level of cohesion that characterizes Negro communities" as being far below the general level in American cities.[66] At the same time, Coleman continues, there is lack of mutual trust, "a belief in my mind that if I aid you today, you will aid me when I am in need."[67] It is possible to gain a different impression from some research studies.

In his study of Roxbury, a Negro ghetto in Boston, Feagin found no evidence of social isolation among the residents.[68] "The overwhelming majority of these Negroes," according to Feagin, "feel that they have a duty to aid their neighbors."[69] He estimated that they were "probably as well integrated with their neighbors as whites in various socioeconomic areas of our urban complexes."[70] In his study of a public housing project in St. Louis, Moore observed: "The disadvantaged family is an oasis in the environment of urban indifference .... The attitude of the disadvantaged family is one of helping each other."[71] Choldin studied the help which migrants to Chicago received during their first year there; he included six ethnic groups.[72] Two thirds of all migrants met a waiting friend or relative; Negroes–more precisely, non-whites–met someone with more than average frequency.[73] "Non-whites," according to Choldin, "are more likely to receive help from the person who receives them."[74] He also found that white and non-white migrants were remarkably similar "in making social connections and adjusting to the neighborhoods .... "[75]

A distinguishing mark of the ghetto is its concentration of people and social contacts within small compass. Smith and associates trace the growing residential segregation in the Detroit metropolitan area as well as the widening of what they term the "interaction gap," i.e., the range of Negro-white contacts.[76] By plotting an "interactional ellipse" around a center line of interaction, the researchers found that "the area of the mean ellipse for whites is 48 square miles."[77] The black area is much smaller. In Roxbury, Feagin found of his sample that "approximately 95 percent of their friends and 97 percent of their relatives live within the Roxbury-Dorchester area."[78] When Roxbury people moved–which was often–the mean distance was only 1.01 miles from their "old" neighborhood.[79] At the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, Moore discovered that 63 percent of the 200 preschoolers had never left the project, an area of 25 square blocks;[80] more poignantly, he reported: "83 percent of the preschool children studied had never been to the city zoo."[81]

Rowland studied the extent of black-white social contact in six cities. These were Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Dayton, Akron, San Francisco, and Boston. Social contact across racial lines was found to be twice as prevalent among blacks. Over four-fifths of the blacks scored high on an integration scale, while three-quarters of the whites scored low. Blacks as a whole regard the pace of integration as too slow; whites who have frequent contact with blacks share this sentiment. Among the blacks, 27 percent reported having interracial friends but 41 percent of the whites were without black friends. While economic level of blacks is directly related to their degree of interracial contact, no more than 10 percent of blacks at any economic level score low on the integration scale. For blacks, the devotion to integration seemed almost unrelated to degrees of interracial social contact. In other words, blacks accepted integration whether or not they had white friends.[82] Rowland's findings are not unexpected. Yet, it bears repeating that these strong integrationist views are held by persons who live in severely constricted areas of their respective cities.

The quality of human contact in the ghetto is not defined by the geographical constriction. Feagin warns that the ghetto does not mean "isolation, impersonality, or disorganization. Intimate ties are maintained even within the ethnic slum."[83] A high degree of friendship relationships existed among the 120 Roxbury wives who were interviewed by Feagin. Much visiting occurs with relatives and friends. This, however, is more than twice as frequent among middle income respondents as low income respondents.[84]

The ghetto is not only compressed; its people are, in Feagin's words, encapsulated. Moore reported that not a single family in the public housing project subscribed to a newspaper; in Roxbury many families were subscribers. In the 1963 *Newsweek* poll, only 37 percent of low-income Negro families outside the South reported having a telephone; this was considerably lower than even nonurban southern Negroes.[85] Of the former families 25 percent were were without a television set; only 15 percent of the latter group lacked TV in the home.

A very real encapsulating force is the metropolitan press. Blacks read major dailies far more frequently than any black publication. During the years 1954-1968, a period of growing black protest, four Chicago metropolitan daily newspapers took a hostile attitude toward black leaders, goals, and mass movements. Kelly, who studied the record of these newspapers, has documented this finding. During the 1950's the newspapers, liberal and conservative alike, ignored school segregation. A decade later they denied the existence of racial discrimination in the schools. They were critical of demands for integration or for separation. Dr. Martin Luther King and the Black Muslim leader, Elijah Muhammad, were criticized. Civil rights advocates using nonviolence or violence were resisted in editorials. All four newspapers were critical of the historic march on Washington in 1963 as well as demonstrations in Chicago against segregated schools.[86] It is difficult to establish precise effects of this style of editorial treatment on thinking in black areas of the city. One researcher, Sharon, contends that blacks read editorials less frequently than do whites.[87] It would seem reasonable to surmise that the atmosphere of criticism created by the press could not help but strengthen a feeling among blacks of isolation from the larger community.

The ghetto is a place of first and last resort; the interim is spent trying to escape from it. Feagin studied the reasons why persons in his sample had located somewhere in Roxbury. He found:

> . . . At least, 72 percent were forced to enter the housing market by urban renewal, etc., whether or not they actually wanted to do so . . . . Thus, selectivity–in the sense of a person choosing a project solely in order to increase social interaction–does not seem to be an important factor in the housing choices of most of these Negro families.[88]

In a St. Louis public housing project, poverty ruled out any choice of housing or even of food: "The family is frequently without enough money to plan from one meal to the other."[89]

New migrants to a large city are highly dependent on the ethnic neighborhood. Negroes, according to Choldin, are especially so: "They are most likely to stay in the neighborhood, most likely to feel that it is sufficient for them, and least likely to visit the public places of the city."[90] White southern migrants, on the other hand, regard the white slum as a temporary stopping place; they are not committed to the community; and they are isolated from their non-southern neighbors.[91]

There is little attachment of the urban Negro to his neighborhood. About one third of a sample of Chicago Negroes thought that their neighborhood was declining. As for a comparison of Negro-white attitudes toward neighborhood, the study found:

> Negroes dislike their neighborhoods much more than whites dislike theirs. Only 19 percent of the Negroes rated their neighborhood as a "very good" place . . . whereas 62 percent of the white respondents made this report. . . . Negroes who regard their neighborhood as "very good" are less militant than those who regard their neighborhood as "fairly bad" or "very bad."[92]

Respondents were asked to base their opinion on the totality of elements entering into a neighborhood: schools, play facilities, police and fire protection, street cleaning and garbage removal, and public transportation.

Moore writes: "Disadvantaged homes *do* have an educational tradition. . . . Its preoccupation is with survival."[93] It would seem that the ghetto neighborhood is not regarded as essential to this tradition.

Moving out of the ghetto is a privilege enjoyed primarily by middle class Negroes. Even then, only some actually make the move. Bullough studied the social-psychological characteristics of those who moved. She compared middle class Negroes in (a) predominantly Negro ghetto areas in West Los Angeles and Pacoima, (b) an integrated fringe of Baldwin Hills, and (c) the predominantly white area of the San Fernando Valley. None of the subjects was poor. The median income of Negroes living in the ghetto was $9,700 while those living in the integrated areas earned $11,000. What factors impelled the latter to move from the ghetto?

Bullough found that feelings of alienation and powerlessness were significantly less among those Negroes who had moved.[94] And "the childhood experiences most related to lower powerlessness scores are those of integrated school experience and living in a racially mixed neighborhood while growing up."[95] On the other hand: "Segregation in the past is related to present alienation scores. Experience with segregation seems to have long term psychological consequences which can later influence the behavior of the individual as an adult."[96]

Poverty and discrimination erect the ghetto walls, declared Bullough, but the walls are kept standing also by "the feelings of powerlessness, hopelessness, and social distance which have developed out of the segregated experiences of ghetto life."[97] The longer former ghetto residents live in integrated areas, the less they socialize with former friends in their old neighborhood; and the less the ghetto orientation, the greater the fall in feelings of powerlessness and anomie.[98] Bullough concludes: "The fact that choosing the integrated way of life in one sphere is related to choosing it in others suggests that any sort of program aimed at decreasing segregation is worth trying."[99]

In a NORC survey, it was found that whether or not the Negro respondent had attended a desegregated school strongly influenced his response to the following question: "Is it a hardship on a Negro child to go to an integrated school if he is one of a small number of Negroes in the school?" Here is a compilation of the responses:[100]

	Northern born: school was		Southern born: school was		Southern born: educated in
	integrated	segregated	integrated	segregated	segregated school
	percent		percent		percent
Response					
'Yes, it is a hardship	33	43	30	48	50

The primary objective of the survey was to measure the long-run effects of school integration on adult Negroes; the respondents were between the ages of 21 and 45. The summary findings of the survey are as follows:

> . . . The impact of integration is widespread. Negro graduates of integrated schools are more likely to have attended and graduated from college. . . . The present study found that [Negro students in integrated schools not only score higher on achievement tests while in school but] they continue to score higher as adults. They are more likely to have better jobs and higher incomes. In general, they have more contact with whites as adults, less anti-white feeling, and in general, stronger feelings of optimism about the opportunities available to them and a greater sense of happiness. . . .[101]

The survey found, too, that Negro adults who had attended integrated elementary schools were, contrary to common expectation, not from higher socioeconomic circumstances than adults who had attended segregated schools. (Education and marital stability of parents were the measures of socioeconomic status of family.)

Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "Good luck is just as important as hard work for success." The following tabulation illustrates the finding.[102]

Percent disagreeing with statement by integration of elementary and high school, northern-born students

	Elementary School	
High school	Integrated	Segregated
Integrated	50	26
Segregated	39	37

NORC found that "those who attended integrated schools in the North are much more likely to disagree with this item than those who attended segregated schools."[103]NORC reported indirect evidence that Negroes who had attended integrated schools made more informal contacts with whites which led more frequently to a job.[104]

In general, Negroes who attended integrated schools as children are less antagonistic toward whites even if the Negroes now live in segregated housing. NORC comments: "Past contact with whites is a substitute for present contact in breaking down Negro desires to avoid whites. This implies that even if segregation in other aspects of American society is unchanged, an increase in school integration will in itself increase the willingness of Negroes to associate with whites."[105] On the other hand, less social distance does not mean greater illusions. Nearly nine-tenths of the once-desegregated Negroes agreed that "the trouble with white people is that they think they are better than other people."[106]

Having attended an integrated school has a profound influence on the Negro adult. In ascertaining respondents' feeling of happiness:

> ... We find that having a high education, having attended an integrated school, or having a high number of contacts with whites each increases happiness, and surprisingly, school integration is the most important of the three factors.[107]

NORC suggests that school integration enhances the self-conception of the Negro and thus contributes to his happiness.[108]

NORC also interviewed a national sample of adult whites during the summer of 1966. In a few cases, it was possible to trace the effects upon them of having attended integrated schools. Uniformly, these adults had more favorable attitudes toward integration of the school in their present neighborhood, and expressed less anti-Negro prejudice.

Percent highly prejudiced, among white persons who
did and did not attend school with Negroes, by educational
status of respondent and spouse

Educational status of respondent and spouse	Attended school with Negroes	Attended all-white schools
Very High	11	12
High	12	11
Medium	27	35
Low	15	25

Even among the most highly prejudiced whites, those who had attended integrated schools were less likely to be prejudiced.[109]

The NORC survey data on whites were analyzed in greater detail under supervision of Pettigrew.[110] In general, but more so for males than for females, adult whites who had attended desegregated schools reported that at least at one time they had a close Negro friend, had been visited at home by a Negro friend, and were living in a neighborhood that housed some Negroes at the time of the inquiry. White adults who had experienced interracial schooling tended to favor interracial neighborhoods. The effect of having had a Negro friend at one time is a powerful factor in determining a favorable attitude toward interracial neighborhoods. Among white respondents who had attended segregated schools, those who had had a Negro friend at one time were more favorable to integrated neighborhoods than those who had never had a Negro friend.

Pettigrew drew three major conclusions from this analysis:

> Prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will have and will continue to have contact with Negro Americans. . . .
>
> To a lesser extent, prior desegregated schooling enhances the probability that white Americans will express more positive attitudes toward interracial contact and Negro rights. . . .
>
> Childhood contact leads to later contact and to more favorable attitudes toward contact; it leads somewhat less to rejection of racially discriminatory practices, and little if any to more positive acceptance of Negro protest.[111]

He noted several reservations of a procedural nature about the data gathered. These related to the inability to control for several variables. In the main, however, Pettigrew held that these difficulties did not vitiate the aforementioned conclusions.

In an Oakland, Calif., study data were collected on the consequence of attendance in interracial schools. Three findings were noted:

> 1. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing for their offspring to have an interracial education than those who attended segregated schools.
> 2. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are more willing to live in biracial neighborhoods (irrespective of difficulty encountered) and are more likely to have white friends, than Negroes who attended segregated schools.
> 3. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools are on the average less suspicious of whites, and feel somewhat more at ease in a biracial setting, than similar Negroes who attended segregated schools.[112]

These findings were highly consistent with those of the NORC study.

The black urban community is a complex social arrangement composed of unequal portions of compulsion and choice. In the realm of more intimate social relations, the element of choice is greatest. Recent expansion in educational opportunities, many stemming from civic action originating in that community, have broadened further areas of voluntary action. Overshadowing these positive developments is the continued pressure of racial discrimination in housing, employment, and education. Black interest in gaining a larger share of opportunity has led to increasing interest in leaving the ghetto. Experience outside the ghetto proves to be enduring in its positive effects on both black and white.

WHITE FLIGHT - BLACK PLIGHT?

Deeply imbedded in contemporary educational research is a belief that white parents will automatically withdraw their children from a desegregated school when black (or other minority) enrollment reaches a certain level—often placed at 30 to 40 percent. Presumably, up to that point whites will remain and the racial composition is stable. After that point, the stability is upset or tipped over" and whites flee. Soon, the school's enrollment becomes all-black. The hypothesis of a tipping point is represented as having been established by research. As such, it is commended to policymakers for their guidance in changing schools. The clearest import of the hypothesis seems to be: go slowly in desegregating. In more than one court, judges have agreed to permit all-black schools to remain segregated on the explicit ground that to attempt to desegregate them would be fruitless; the tipping point would be exceeded at the outset. White parents' refusal to cooperate would leave the schools wholly black.

This hypothesis became popular during the early 1960's, a time of insignificant desegregation in the Deep South and North, and of only a slight degree of desegregation in a few border areas. It was a period of tokenism *par excellence.* Courts were not requiring desegregation plans to result in actual desegregation. Announcement of a willingness to desegregate was judged sufficient. Clearly, whatever desegregation occurred was greatly dependent on the sufferance of white parents and local school officials. Under these circumstances, even tokenism was regarded as progress. Black children were not, in fact, accorded a legal *right* to attend. Thus, concern of some observers and school people for not "rocking the boat" led to a concern with an optimal percentage of minority children. The optimality, however, was not based on educational so much as on a tactical consideration of how many minority children could be tolerated by politically salient elements in the community.

A decade later, the situation had changed significantly. In 1972, for example, nearly 1.3 million white children were attending predominantly minority schools. (See chapter 6, page 5 D.) Many of the schools involved had stable enrollments despite the tipping point hypothesis. Judicial doctrine had shifted from declaring the right of individual children to select from among available schools to stressing the obligation of entire school systems to be nondiscriminatory. Whether or not a school was racially identifiable became the touchstone of successful desegregation. The personal dispositions of white parents now became all but irrelevant when it was a matter of the preferred racial composition of a specific school. Under the new circumstances, the tipping point hypothesis took on new life with the name "resegregation," The term tipping point implied a preexistent, evenhanded balance, where, in fact, law and administrative policy had created a discriminatory distribution of children by race. Resegregation suggested that a once-segregated system or school had been desegregated but in vain, since whites left (or, prospectively, would leave) when black children began arriving in large numbers.

How does the tipping point hypothesis hold up when tested by empirical evidence drawn from studies of schools with changing racial composition? The hypothesis holds that at some undetermined point the exodus of white students suddenly accelerates. The suddenness signals the tipping.

Koponen studied changing schools in Hartford, Conn. While he readily located black neighborhoods that were once white, he was unable to find a single case of sudden changes in black enrollment which, *as such*, led to white flight from a specific school. Discussing one area of the city, Koponen emphasized that white flight from schools there was more likely to reflect avoidance of "educational inadequacy and excessive class size" than simply fleeing from black children.[113] He suggested that political authorities in Hartford, eager to discredit desegregation by demonstrating its impracticality, were assigning large numbers of non-white children to a few schools rather than assigning many to vacant seats available in nearby white schools. The Koponen study is partly empirical and partly speculative. It has a special value for its consideration of political factors in desegregation.

Cochran and Uhlman reviewed desegregation experience in North Carolina for the year 1967-68. They found that school desegregation was most extensive in those counties with very few blacks. Even small increases in black population, however, led to larger drops in percent of blacks in desegregated schools. After a point, however, further increases in black population started to lead to lesser declines in percent desegregated. In other words, the researchers found no "specific threshold" or tipping point. They explain that "lax policy enforcement coupled with strong local resistance, possibly motivated by fears of economic competition, may have produced the marked curvilinear relationship uncovered here. . . ."[114]

Munford began a study of desegregation in Mississippi, believing in the general applicability of a tipping point. He found, however, no specific numerical point beyond which whites tended to accelerate their movement out of desegregated schools. Instead, he observed that "white children abandoned the public schools . . . [for private schools] roughly in proportion to the percentage of black population in each district, no more and no less."[115] Thus, students left a specific school but the reason for the movement related not to racial proportions at that single school but in the school district as a whole.

Munford tested the tipping point hypothesis and what he calls the leadership hypothesis. This latter refers to the contention that the course of desegregation can be determined by the position taken by important community leaders. Tipping was rejected as an explanation because it failed to account for the observed facts. For example, when Munford compared changes in white enrollment in schools of similar racial composition, experience varied greatly. Following is the record of changes in white percentages in schools from Spring 1970—court-ordered desegregation began in January—to September 1970:[116]

	Number of schools showing:			Average change for all schools in the range
Whites in Spring 1970 percent range	Gain	Loss	No change	from Spring to September 1970 percent
0-10	14	4	5	+2.2
41-50	6	3	3	+4.2
81-90	3	2	1	+1.8

White enrollment grew the most during the interim in the "blacker" schools. The tipping point hypothesis would predict the opposite.

The leadership hypothesis, too, failed to account for much. After examining the record of community response to desegregation in each of the counties studied, Munford found "the influence of leadership was small and it diminished over time."[117] In some counties, whites followed organized segregationists and withdrew their children from the public schools; in other comparable counties, they did not. Similarly, in some places white community leaders solid in support of continued desegregation of the public schools seemed to have a positive effect; elsewhere, they did not.

Why, then, was the black percentage of population in the county school district as a whole so determinative of white flight from certain schools? Munford stressed political implications. He wrote:

> In a county two-thirds Negro, blacks would have possessed a majority of the electorate and might have been able to put Negroes into public office; only the might of superior white economic power would have prevented blacks from ruling the county.[118]

In a black-dominated county government the schools would ultimately be black controlled as well. White parents feared more than a loss in political power. They suspected that the doctrine of white supremacy would be excluded in such circumstances, and they were unwilling to entrust their children to a regime of equality. Munford's pessimism at this reality was tempered somewhat by the debility of the tipping hypothesis. If whites reserved the right not be "tipped", perhaps some day they might also decide to reenter the public schools. (Since Munford made his study, in 1971, white children have continued to reenter the public schools of Mississippi, but at a slow pace.)[119]

Some inquiry has been made into white flight in Pasadena, Calif. Kurtz contends that desegregation in Pasadena resulted in a sizable increase of white flight. During 1970-72, according to Kurtz, white flight doubled over the level of the previous 2 years in the absence of desegregation.[120] In a Federal court proceeding during 1974, Professor Jane Mercer testified that the white percentage in Pasadena schools had been falling for years prior to the 1970 desegregation plan, as it had for many California school districts which had no desegregation. The judge agreed and held no evidence had been produced to prove the school board's argument that desegregation was intensifying white flight.[121]

Both Pontiac and Kalamazoo, Mich., desegregated schools in 1971. Bosco and Robin were interested in discovering a possible connection between desegregation and white flight. They compared the predesegregation years of 1969 and 1970 with the desegregation period. During the first year of desegregation, the percentage of blacks in the Kalamazoo schools remained virtually unchanged, with few whites leaving the system. In Pontiac, on the other hand, during the initial year of desegregation black enrollment increased 4.6 percent over the year before; many whites left the city's schools. It may be noted that near both cities were numerous school systems that had not desegregated and thus constituted viable alternatives for white parents seeking to avoid desegregation. Yet, alternatives were not chosen in Kalamazoo; they were in Pontiac. The researchers hold that once the initial year passed, even in Pontiac, white exit from the schools probably slowed down. In any event, the higher rate of white exit in Pontiac was attributed to effective protest by opponents of mandatory busing.[122]

The largest scale and most systematic study of white flight was made by Cataldo and associates in Florida. A ramdom sample of white parents in eight representative desegregated school districts was used. Over the 2-year period of the study–1971-72 and 1972-73–only 3.6 percent of all parents refused to send their children to the school to which they had been assigned.

Since all the State's school districts are desegregated, no enclaves of segregation exist there. The only alternative to attendance in a desegregated public school is a private school. Financial ability counts heavily, as the researchers found. When the parents who refused to participate in desegregation–the rejecters–were arranged by income class, the rejection rate was 7 percent for upper income persons, 4 percent for middle, and 2 percent for low-income respondents.

No tipping point as such was established, but the percent of black enrollment in individual schools did play a limited role, although not as an independent factor. Cataldo and associates observed that 30 percent black seemed to mark the threshold. Parental rejection increased significantly as this threshold was approached. Once passed, however, higher degrees of black enrollment had no additional effect on rejection. Indeed, rejection rates rose from 2 percent to 8 percent as the 30 percent black figure loomed. Beyond that point, rejection rates fell to 4 percent–nearer to the level of low rejecters than that of high rejecters. Also operating was a social class effect. Low-income parents passing the 30 percent threshold rejected at a rate of 4 percent; high income parents, at a rate of 17 percent. High-income parents whose children were assigned to a school over 30 percent black showed high probability of rejecting.

Busing as such was found to have no influence on the decision to reject. Parents whose children were slated to be bused did not reject at a higher rate than parents whose children were not scheduled for busing. Either below or above the 30 percent threshold, busing did not make for more rejection. Nor was racial prejudice found to influence the rejection rate significantly.

Over time, the researchers stress, opposition to desegregation declines. White parents become accustomed to their children attending schools with black children. Hewing to a 30 percent goal will not prevent initial flight of whites, they say. There is no reason to exclude the possibility that as time goes on higher thresholds may become more acceptable. In that event, racial balances from school to school must be kept constant.

At least two observations may be made about the Cataldo research. First, no tipping point was discovered. Instead, there was a threshold effect that operated under varying conditions. Tipping and threshold, however, are very different concepts. Tipping envisions a veritable flood of blacks in and whites out. No such thing happened in any of the eight districts. Instead, a small trickle occurred–3.6 percent. As the researchers observe, an annual rate of this size could accumulate over a period of years into a sizable group. Implied in the observation, perhaps, is an indication that successful desegregation gives the school more time to solve educational problems in the interest of all children.

Second, desegregation in Florida occurs in a context of complete coverage. This is one reason for the quantitative lead of the South versus the North in desegregation during recent years. There are few other places to go. It is not difficult to imagine that Cataldo's research would have encountered far different findings if Florida were a collection of Pontiacs, with plentiful segregated alternatives nearby. This fact has led many to consider the creation of metropolitan school districts in an effort to eliminate segregated alternatives near the large cities of North and South. That only about one out of every 33 white parents "fled" in Florida is compelling testimony.

PARENT PARTICIPATION

Gordon has remarked:

> The tradition in school administration of discouraging lay people, particularly poor or minority lay people, from participating in the determination of school policy will need to be sharply modified. These parents and community spokesmen may be a hidden resource which the depressed area schools have used inappropriately or not at all.[123]

It might be said that a fairly widespread reconsideration of the Negro parents' role in the school is under way. Part of it arises from political exigencies; organized parent groups are demanding an increased voice. A smaller part is due to growing knowledge and awareness of the actual parental role. In the process of this new consciousness, a number of traditional preconceptions are being revised.

Some years ago a school administrator stated what was and still is a common understanding: "It is the better communities which get the better school facilities and they get them because they are more articulate."[124] Inferentially, then, the less "better" communities were inarticulate; often, they were also assumed to be apathetic about the schools. In certain respects, this view was realistic; in the largest measure, however, it was an oversimplification. At any rate, one could be fairly sure that the preconceptions were seldom tested against the reality of the Negro community. It was not a congenial subject for Caucasian researchers, nor, apparently, for Negro middle class researchers.

More recently, scholarly excursions into the ghetto have increased. Consequently, more adequate bases are developing for understanding the relation of the Negro community to the school.

More than a dozen years ago, Riessman found that the Negro worker in Philadelphia was more willing than the white worker to participate in school affairs: ". . . The proportion of Negro workers indicating a positive willingness to participate in community and school activity is approximately the same for the white middle class group."[125] In the Detroit metropolitan area, when support is defined in terms of willingness to pay taxes, "Negro blue collar workers are more supportive of education than are whites who are professional, technical, or kindred."[126] In Washington, D.C., Negro parents attend PTA meetings somewhat more frequently than white parents.[127] Among Negro parents in the extremely large-scale Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, a researcher reported that "a significant number of parents (84 percent) revealed a positive attitude toward education; however, only (43 percent) expressed a positive attitude toward teachers."[128] In a Chicago ghetto school where 63 percent of the students live in public housing, teachers rated nearly 70 percent of the parents as cooperative.[129] The great number of public demonstrative actions on behalf of desegregation, discussed earlier, also indicate a positive orientation toward schools. De Berry and Agger reported that in Portland, Oreg., "Negroes–much more than whites–would like to have more influence in school affairs than they feel they have currently."[130]

Nevertheless, a completely new day has not yet dawned. Wayson studied teaching conditions in Chicago Negro ghetto schools. Experienced teachers who remained in these schools regarded as one attractive feature of the job "insularity from parental and other community pressures."[131] Wayson adds: "The slum school is isolated from the community and from parents who would question teachers' action."[132] Gross and associates apparently had no great difficulty finding lower socioeconomic status (SES) schools in which parents took little interest in their children's education. They were able to make this generalization among others: For low SES schools, the greater the average parental interest in the academic performance of their children, the higher the academic productivity of the school.[133]

Hollister studied parent-school relations in 18 Detroit elementary schools.[134] Four of the schools were low-income Negro schools; six were middle-class white schools; and eight were integrated schools. He found:

> . . . Both low-income Negro parents and middle-income white parents have greater interest in education, higher educational aspirations for their children, values and standards that are more congruent with those of the school, and greater knowledge of how to help their child get through school than low-income white parents [in the integrated schools] . . . .[135]

Lower income white parents were less likely than either middle-income or Negro parents to initiate contact with the school. Hollister noted the contradiction between this finding and "much of the current practice literature that assumes uniformly indifferent attitudes toward the school among low-income populations."[136]

In the preceding pages there have been numerous references to the role of students' families in desegregation. Meketon stressed the supportive and counseling functions of parents. Coles had cited numerous clinical examples of the same phenomenon. Anderson found that achievement of desegregated Negro children bore no relationship to whether or not the children's families were intact or broken. In 1956, the schools of Louisville were redistricted and many children were assigned to schools of the opposite race. Garth reports that 45 percent of the Negro parents and 85 percent of the white parents involved requested that their children be transferred to schools of their own race.[137]

In three studies, white children in desegregated schools were found to be less prejudiced than the white community in general: (1) in Alabama, according to Chesler and Segal, (2) in an integrated northern school, according to Kaplan and Matkom, and (3) in Oak Ridge, Tenn., according to Sartain.[138] In their study of interracial schools in several small Mid-western communities, Schmuck and Luszki found Negro students performing uniformly on a level at or above white students.[139] As measured by students' responses, Negro parents were more interested in children's schoolwork than were white parents; also, "Negro boys spoke of their families in significantly more positive terms than the white boys."[140]

Meyers studied Negro achievement in relation to family structure.[141] Her sample consisted of 46 Negro boys from a Harlem school; all were of normal intelligence and were evenly divided between good and poor achievers. She found:

> The hypothesis that Negro boys from an economically disadvantaged environment with a positive self-concept would be achievers in the elementary school situation was supported. . . . Based on a qualitative analysis of family interaction, a body of evidence was presented to support the final hypothesis that Negro boys would function as school achievers if at least one parent, or some adult *in loco parentis,* assumed executive guidance and control over the household.[142]

Meyers pointed to the motivating influence of the civil rights movement and related activities and observed that these factors raised "new perspectives for teachers, guidance counselors, psychologists and family life educators working with and within the Negro community."[143] Rosenberg's study of parental interest, although not dealing specifically with Negro children and parents, arrived at a conclusion that is not dissonant with Meyers' conclusion: "... Rather extreme [parental] indifference is associated with low self-esteem, but whether the interest in the child is strong or mild often appears to make less difference."[144] More broadly, a national study of school principals reported "that principals perceive that even in schools in the most disadvantaged areas, a large majority of the parents are interested in their children's performance."[145]

In a study of Negro and white mothers of preschool children, Platoff found that whether a mother had herself attended integrated schools might be significantly related to her disposition to relate democratically to her children: "... Integrated education is the only additional predictor, beyond the major predictors of education and race, which yields a high correlation with the attitudes expressed by mothers in situations which symbolically represent typical mother-preschool child interactions.[146]" The point was raised by Platoff as a possibility only.

In Hartford, Conn., Dunmore studied the decisions by eligible families, whether to participate in a voluntary busing plan with West Hartford. A long series of comparisons was made between families who accepted and those who refused the opportunity. Numerous social-psychological tests were taken by persons in both groups. Dunmore concluded that "communication and not social-psychological variables were critical to the acceptance of the opportunity."[147] Those who accepted had significantly more chance to accept.

In Chapel Hill, N.C., Prichard found that "after desegregation, many Negro parents are not as active in school functions as they were within their own segregated schools. Many of the most active and outspoken Negro parents in the Chapel Hill community became inactive and silent in the integrated school affairs."[148] This problem is rarely described in the research literature.

In a study of educational climates, McDill and associates sought to establish the mechanisms whereby the climates affected student aspiration and achievement. In the process they studied intensively 20 high schools in 8 States. "... The critical factor in explaining the impact of the high school environment on the achievement and educational aspirations of students," they concluded, "is the degree of parental and community interest in quality education."[149] And further: "... The intellectual and social camaraderie between schools and families ... appears to be the hallmark of schools with strong academic climates."[150] Undoubtedly, the families are white and middle class. It would be most significant—and urgent—to explore whether such beneficial consequence would flow from close school-community relations with Negro and lower class families. (This last sentence was written in 1970, for an earlier edition of the present work. Since then, few researchers have studied the relationship.)

Between 1971 and 1973, empirical studies of parent participation in schools were made in three cities.

Raffel studied participation of various ethnic groups in 10 Boston schools. He found great variation in the degree to which parents trusted the Boston school system to educate their children. The following table summarizes responses by 400 parents in percentages.[151]

Teachers consistently mispreceived parental aspirations for their children, for the most part devaluing the high aspirations. Especially at schools serving working-class and minority children, the discrepancy between parents and teacher perception was high. Teachers tended to underreport having received praise from parents while parents tended to overreport having tendered such praise. In the two schools enrolling the greatest number of black children, only one-third to one-fifth the number of teachers acknowledged being influenced by parents in the degree parents thought they successfully exerted influence. In middle-class schools the discrepancy was smaller.

The schools were least responsive to black parents, as a consequence, black parents were most insistent on changes in the school system. Raffel wrote:

> Black parents tend to be suspicious of the motives of teachers and their relations with their children... A majority of parents at the schools serving black children ... want control over personnel. Those that do also want control over content and methods.... Three of the four schools where [teacher] satisfaction is lowest serve black children.[153]

Extent of positive parental trust in the Boston public school system by ethnicity and education

Ethnicity	Highest education in the family: Less than high school graduate percent	High school graduate percent	College graduate or more percent
Negro	13	5	0
Irish	46	58	50
Italian	40	51	25
Chinese	93	81	50
Other	45	41	43
Average Total	38	44	44

Except for the Irish, there is a trend for trust in the schools to decline with the level of education achieved. Raffel also reports that "from 50 to 60 percent of the respondents are cynical or with a low feeling of efficacy or control vis-a-vis the Boston schools."[152] Relatively few parents of other ethnic groups share the black interest in control. "Only one in four parents surveyed," reports Raffel, "want parents to play a role in selecting and replacing teachers and principals."[154]

Responsiveness to parents, Raffel concludes, is nonexistent across the schools studied. Parents' desires are not accurately perceived, their wishes are not, in the main, regarded as legitimate, and teachers and principals are unable to carry out changes in the educational program that would meet some of the parents' desires.

Phillips studied black participation in school affairs in Newark, N.J., from 1958 to 1972. He concentrated on the board of education and central administration. In Phillips' view, the period saw the school system change from an exclusively white-operated preserve into a far more responsive institution. Until 1943, only 13 black teachers worked in the schools. Five years later they formed an association for social and professional purposes. In 1950, 46 of the total of 63 black teachers taught in largely black schools. They mounted a campaign against what they regarded as discriminatory assignments. During the 1950's, headway was made in convincing the school board to assure a more equitable employment and distribution of teachers. In 1959 the school board established a Newark residency requirement for staff personnel. Since somewhat over half the city's population was then black, this policy would probably create a number of high-level school jobs for blacks. Phillips stated, but did not describe in detail, that central administrators—all of whom were white—successfully gained a court reversal of the policy.

Indeed, Phillips viewed the central administration as capable of "interference" with board policies. He often lumps together the teacher organization and the administration. In a long listing, Phillips summarizes their common role:

> Though the Board of Education did not always respond reasonably to the demands of the blacks, when it did respond favorably the response was usually met with interference. . . . The professional educators (1) often failed to implement . . policy involving the transfer of personnel to assure an equitable distribution of teachers throughout the educational institution, (2) through court action overturned the Board of Education decisions that required Newark residency for administrative personnel, (3) failed to publicize the voluntary pupil transfer system, (4) continuously neglected to implement curriculum policy with alacrity, (5) contrary to Board of Education policy actively supported legislative measures that would limit the period required for tenure in administrative and supervisory positions to 2 years, (6) denied admittance to blacks, in acting administrative positions, to memberships in the local principals' association, and (7) fostered improvement in their financial and general working condition to the virtual exclusion of the ramifications that certain changes were bad on the welfare of their student clients.[155]

Most of these items are described in detail by Phillips.

To appraise independently the factual basis of Phillips' bill of particulars would require considerable research. Aside from this problem is the value of Phillips' approach. Educational research almost always presents administration as a purely technical function, carried out in a realm distinctly below the level of policy. On the other hand, student and parent protests since 1965 have frequently been aimed at the administration as much as the school board. In New York City, for example, much more "heat" by civil rights protesters was applied around the heads of administration and organized teachers than around the board of education.

Ironically, however, while the Newark school system is, according to Phillips, becoming less discriminatory, its educational adequacy does not seem to be thriving. Both in 1968 and 1974 official inquiries concluded that the system was failing by far to educate a majority of the children enrolled in the system; 75 percent of them were black in 1975.[156] The politically realistic perspective of Phillips can be pursued with profit. Its exclusive use, however, would not yield much knowledge of educational operations within the classroom. Undoubtedly, large urban school systems cannot be understood or changed outside a political perspective. To deny this would seem to be a political act in itself.[157]

Reporting on the outcome of an experiment in parent advisory councils, Mann found more or less what Phillips might have predicted–real power to change educational arrangements continued to be monopolized by official structures. As a result, nothing significant changed. "As long as formal, overt modifications in the singular laws of responsibility are not made." Mann concluded, "as long as we have not found a way for communities to share effective responsibility, then it is unrealistic to expect very much sharing to take place."[158]

One can only share what one possesses, especially if it is power. The sharing of power by parents and schools waits upon its redistribution.

COMMUNITY CONTROL

During the 1930's, when W.E.B. DuBois held out little hope for an end to segregation, he advised facing up to the reality of segregated schools. "Control of their own education, which is the logical and inevitable end of separate schools, he wrote, "would not be an unmixed ill; it might prove a supreme good. . . ."[159] Chief among the possible advantages he mentioned were heightened self-confidence and group consciousness. The greatest disadvantage would be greater "race antagonism." DuBois' thinking was quite in line with historic black opinion; see, for example, the statement of the *New York Globe* in 1883, p. 1. Always the first choice was a nonsegregated school. Denied this preferred alternative, black leaders often turned inward. However, just as DuBois in the 1940's later regained confidence in the possibilities of integration, so too, did the larger black community.

Community control of schools by ethnic minorities has never been practiced in this country, except in the case of one large group of Indians during the 19th century. Even then, community control was gained not as an aspect of ethnicity but because these particular tribes were sovereign independent nations, recognized by Federal law. Neither their Indian contemporaries nor their successors ever shared such a lofty legal status.

Beginning in the early 1960's the issue of community control arose in New York City. Its immediate context was in line with historical precedent–the refusal of dominant white society to institute desegregated schools and the resultant moves by blacks to turn inward. Several studies were conducted dealing with the circumstances that led to the turn. An examination of the educational consequences of the new arrangement follows along with a discussion of the significance of these experiences. Finally, events in several other cities are reported.

NEW YORK CITY

During the late 1950's, the school integration movement burgeoned among blacks in New York City. Between 1957 and 1960, under the leadership of the Parents Workshop for Equality (PWE), parents demanded the right to send their children to any school with vacant seats. In 1960 the school board yielded and announced a program of open enrollment; parents could select schools where educational opportunities were acknowledged to be superior to those in Harlem. While from 15,000 to 20,000 children ultimately participated, dissatisfaction with the program grew. As

Rev. Milton Galamison, head of PWE, explained retrospectively:

> . . . There was always some feeling in the black community. . . that this did not really help the schools in the ghetto. . . Apart from reducing overcrowding to a degree, it made no contribution at all to the achievement levels of the schools in the ghetto. Second, these parents complained that the total burden for integration was being placed on the black child. . .[160]

Nevertheless, whatever success the program had was attributable primarily to efforts generated by black parents and the civil rights movement. The school board was cool toward the program while many administrators opposed it outright.

A more durable and beneficial form of desegregation was sought by black parents. One approach was to build schools in areas where the population was heterogeneous; the enrollment would then be nonsegregated and children could avail themselves of educational opportunities where they lived. In 1958, the school board announced plans to construct a new junior high school in East Harlem (J.H.S. 201) and that it would be so located as to open with an integrated enrollment. During the following few years, community expectations rose. Construction began in 1964 and the school (named IS 201) was ready to open 2 years later. At this point, however, it had become clear that the school would have only Puerto Rican and black students. The community objected and vowed not to permit it to operate on that basis. School officials countered that exemplary programs at the new school would attract white students on a voluntary basis. Community spokesman during the summer of 1966 pressed their case for integration. In June, a parent leader, Mrs. Babette Edwards, wrote the mayor: "We intend to do everything in our power to stop 201 from being used if it is not operated as an integrated school. . . ."[161] The next month a parents committee filed an official complaint with the city government. It charged that the

> Board of Education is discriminating against children of all minority groups and are perpetuating segregated, inferior schools which will deprive our children from getting quality integrated education. . . . Special programming will not under any circumstances bring voluntary integration to the school, but . . . busing on a forced basis is the only solution to the problem.[162]

Integration formed the sole basis of the movement.

In August, a new element appeared. A leaflet issued by the principal parents' committee read:

> Intermediate School 201 will not open in September Without:
>
> *Integrated Quality Education*
>
> *Or*
>
> *Total Community Control*

The text listed more specific mandates:[164]

> We demand:
> 1) Compulsory Zoning for Integration
> 2) A Program for Excellence
> 3) A Community Committee to Supervise the School
>
> OR
>
> No Integration, then Total Community Control.

After a protracted series of conflicts, the parents of IS 201 attained neither integration nor community control. The school opened and was operated during its early stages on the terms established by the board of education.

The next phase of the community control movement occurred with the creation of three experimental school districts: Ocean Hill - Brownsville, IS 201, and Two Bridges. They operated for 3 years. This innovation was an experiment in which the community was not given the power to control but merely to influence the manner in which the central school board decided to manage. Certain crucial areas of decisionmaking were reserved by the central board; the lines of authority of other areas were vague. Nevertheless, several decision areas were placed under local control; choice of principals and superintendent, for example.

Guttentag has made the most systematic study of the educational consequences of organizing Harlem's experimental IS 201 district. For purposes of comparison, she chose an adjacent school district of similar ethnic and economic characteristics and a suburban district.

Schools in the 201 district were far more community affairs than were schools in the comparison urban or suburban district. Guttentag writes: "In the IS 201 district there was one visitor for every four pupils; in the two comparison districts, one visitor for every 20 pupils."[165] Face-to-face contacts between teachers and parents were also far more frequent in 201 than in the other two districts. The climate of the 201 school was marked by a greater stress on intellectuality and a feeling of openness. Teachers in 201 saw themselves as more self-reliant than teachers in the city generally.

Teacher-student interaction in 201 schools contrasted with that in comparison districts. As Guttentag writes:

> In IS 201, student-initiated talk was more often directly followed either by teacher praise or teacher acceptance of the student's ideas, a highly significant finding. Furthermore, although teacher's race was significantly related to verbal behavior in the comparison schools, this was not true in the community controlled schools.[166]

While teacher-student interaction was relatively free of racial constriction, this did not mean that race of students was ignored. As Guttentag found, while 201 students identified themselves as black just as readily as children in the adjacent Harlem schools, they showed a greater preference for their own race dolls. This was especially true of girls.

Did children in 201 schools learn any more than they had before organization of the special district or than similar children in other schools? Guttentag, who wrote her report in 1972, used the results of the 1971 achievement testing by the Psychological Corporation. She also compared 201 scores with those for the city as a whole. During 1968-69, 201 children, especially first and second graders, did well in the context of citywide figures. Guttentag cites one 201 school that surpassed national norms in reading. Reading levels in 201 schools held up in 1968-69 at a time when city reading levels fell. Achievement test mean scores rose between 1969 and 1971 in the second through sixth grades. She concludes that "achievement in the community controlled schools apparently improved over the 3-year period of their existence."[167] Details are not presented; a proposed book is to make these available.

The self-concepts of 201 children appeared to be significantly more related to others than was the case with comparison children. Both credit for success and blame for failure tended to be placed by children on teachers, parents, and the school rather than on themselves. Guttentag reports that "they more often gave credit to teachers for their own good performance than did comparison children." This strong other-orientation is somewhat related to external control attitudes as discussed earlier (chapter 7, pp. 131-133). It will be recalled that Coleman concluded that high academic achievement was related to an internal, not external, control attitude. Experience in IS 201, as interpreted by Guttentag, contradicts this view. Further support for Guttentag's view comes from a study by Kleinfeld in Washington, D.C., who found that external control attitudes among black students did not predict low achievement.[168] If community control schooling engenders positive external control attitudes, as seems to have happened in the 201 schools, this might be conducive to greater achievement. Kleinfeld holds, however, that achievement among her sample hinged more on academic self-concept rather than on external or internal control attitudes. In this regard, it is interesting to recall that Guttentag found intellectuality to be a prominent feature of the climate of 201 schools.

Guttentag points to two basic reasons for the generally positive educational experiences at 201 schools. First, informal social organization in Harlem is based on the block of residence and thus the small size of the 201 experimental district was a powerful factor in creating a sense of community around the schools. Second, "a powerful and shared ideological commitment" for community control pervaded the school activities of parents, staff, and students.

King studied the attitudes of leading persons in the 201 experiment toward community control and integration. Of the three districts, 201 seemed most united on the centrality of community control. This was truer of leaders of local community action and antipoverty agencies than of local church leaders. A prime element in that commitment was a conviction that the central school board was not in fact concerned about educating minority children. Attitudes differed on residential and school integration. "Although 21 of the [31 IS 201] leaders felt that integrated schools were not necessary for black youngsters to receive a quality education," reports King, "only 15 of the 31 felt that nothing should be done to preserve or encourage a racially integrated city."[169]

All three experimental districts led a stormy existence. A major reason was the overwhelming opposition to the experiments throughout the educational establishment of the city, including organized teachers and governmental leaders. But internal problems proved as important. Charles Wilson, the first unit administrator of the 201 district, seemed to hint at one aspect of these problems when he discussed professional staff attitudes:

> Respect, not love in the traditional "we love the kiddies" way. I think that's one of the offshoots of the professional imperialism we talked about–we love the natives. Hogwash. You're hustling the natives. You love them cause you can hustle them. I'm talking about a sense of respect when you allow the dimensions of humanity to include those who are not middle class, whose mothers don't speak well, whose fathers may not use the same language.[170]

In the absence of detailed studies, it is not possible to discover whether this characterization applies fairly to the teaching staff at 201 schools.

This very issue, however, led in 1971 to the resignation of Mrs. Babette Edwards and Mrs. Hannah Brockington from the directorate of the 201 district. Mrs. Edwards was a pioneer in the movement for community control and had played a prominent role in the events of 1966. Now, the two leaders charged that "we have seen little achievement and accountability, mainly because the so-called black professionals who talk about community control and accountability to the parents and community, display the same contempt [for children] as their white counterparts."[171] In a tone reminiscent of the complaints of Harlem residents in earlier years against schools directly operated by the central board of education, Edwards and Brockington now charged:

> We have heard teachers speak of other teacher's incompetence and abuse of children, without lifting a voice or hand to prevent or stop it, because "to do so would be disloyal to the group." We have seen principals talk about the wonderful job being done in their schools while hundreds of children are being miseducated . . . [201] has from the beginning been battered from the inside and the outside, but even with that it had the potential to be more than it has become.[172]

This bitter judgment suggests the insufficiency of administrative measures in altering basic staff attitudes.

Ocean Hill-Brownsville (OH-B) was the second experimental district. McCoy, who was the district's chief administrator, has written a long analysis of OH-B. Educational issues, such as were examined in the case of IS 201, do not play any role in his work. During the existence of OH-B, he explains, "the district's ability to educate never became a serious focal point of discussion."[173] Indeed, he believes that what he calls "pedagogical skill" is irrelevant to an understanding of the historic events at OH-B. There is considerable support for this view. Faintstein, in referring both to 201 and OH-B, writes: ". . . The experience of the districts offered little data concerning the effects of neighborhood control in a routinized situation. The districts were in a continuous state of flux."[174]

McCoy, however, does not believe that OH-B was simply too busy to educate. Rather, he contends that OH-B was not permitted to educate.

McCoy argues that the dominant white society has joined racism with economic exploitation in a successful effort to withhold education from black children:

> White Americans not only refuse to have their children educated with black children, but they refuse to have black children educated at all. The real reason is not an inbred repugnance to association with educated Negroes, but a very complex understanding that educated Negroes make poor bus boys.[175]

According to McCoy, the teachers union, the school bureaucracy, and the press are allied in an effort to deny education to black children. It is thus understandable that he refers to the "basically reformist mentality" of the OH-B governing board. The board attempted to educate black children within the confines of the existing oppressive system while seeking only to moderate its negative effects. But McCoy regards this course as hopeless and concludes that "a violent revolution is necessary in order to have American's public institutions serve all of its people."[176] He does not oppose further campaigns for community control but declares that these battles will be "fought more for the preservation of dignity than with the expectation of victory."[177]

A study by Gottfried suggests, however, that many parents in OH-B did not regard that experience as futile. Public opinion polls of OH-B parents were made in 1968 and 1970. In the latter poll, 86 percent of the parents reported they had visited a district school during the previous year. Gottfried writes that "the community developed strong feelings of efficacy pertaining to the schools."[178] Over 2 years, parents became greatly more favorable toward teachers; in 1968, only 38 percent of parents responded positively to teachers; in 1970, the figure rose to 77 percent. In these respects, therefore, OH-B functioned successfully, especially when compared with other schools in the ghetto. King, in his study of OH-B found during early 1970 that the 55 local leaders interviewed were almost exactly split as to integration versus separation.[179] (In all three experimental districts, King found that of those local leaders who identified themselves as integrationists, four-fifths also favored community control.)[180]

Two Bridges, the third experimental district, was the most heterogeneous. Of the 5,000 students in the district, 35 percent were Chinese Americans, 35 percent Puerto Ricans, 18 percent mainland whites, and 12 percent blacks. While most of the local leaders were committed to community control, they also favored integrated schools by a margin of two to one.[181] One distinction between Two Bridges and the other districts is that in the former there was much less "grass roots" participation. Guillermo Alonzo, chairman of the district governing board, told King: ". . . We always depended on agency people and the professionals rather than the grass roots people. As a result the community people just turned their backs on us because they felt that the agency people were running the district without caring about the parents."[182] No published record of educational changes at Two Bridges is available.

In 1969, the State legislature passed a law creating 31 community school districts in New York City. Each could select its own superintendent and administrative staff, and the local elected board had certain limited powers. The most important powers were reserved to the central board of education. Community activists were bitter about the limited powers allotted to localities. Antonetty, head of the United Bronx Parents, declared: "The Masters have given the local colonies three clear powers. We are given the power to be in charge of the cafeterias, the recreational centers, and student discipline."[183]

Gittell and associates studied the operation of the community school districts over a 2-year period. Overall, no important changes in educational outcome were found. Of the 31 districts, only two were regarded as "change-agents," another six as "active," and the remaining 23 as "status-quo." In areas of school operation other than curriculum and instruction, however, Gittell found the boards to be more active. After the 1970 elections, community school boards reemployed three-fifths of incumbent superintendents; the new superintendents were selected by traditional criteria, except in one district. Gittell summarizes:

> There have been no major changes in the distribution of power in school decisionmaking. Educational policy in New York City still depends on school professionals in their unions and associations under central contracts and agreements. The central headquarters staff and the Board of Education retains the major share of power.[184]

Unless community school boards gain contracting authority with teachers, contends Gittell, decentralization will not be successful.

Parent participation in the community school districts, especially by poorer citizens, has increased. This extends to attendance at board meetings. Yet, Gittell sees this increased activity as relatively marginal. Thus, in comparing parent action under the decentralization law with that under the three experimental districts, she holds that "the present decentralization does not really compare . . . in the degree to which it has *in fact* opened the gates of participation to previously excluded groups."[185]

Zimet studied the operation of the 1969 decentralization law, using Community District 7, South Bronx as a case study. This district's enrollment consists almost entirely of black and Puerto Rican children. "Based on . . . quantifiable criteria of effectiveness," observes Zimet, ". . . there is little evidence of change either in a positive direction, which would support the hopes of the proponents of decentralization and community control, or in a negative direction, which would justify the fears of its detractors."[186] Even with regard to changes in the ethnic composition of staff the evidence is ambigous. Thus, while the percentage of black and Puerto Rican administrators rose from about 10 to almost 25 percent, few new teachers of these minority groups were employed. One comment by Zimet suggests an unrealized potential of decentralization or community control:

> . . . The Decentralization Law has shifted the burden of failure from the pupils to the school system. The results of this shift are not yet evident, but at least the

> pressure to change is now being exerted on the system rather than on the pupils and their parents.[187]

Yet, the range of powers under control of the local district is so narrow that little room would seem available for further movement along this line. Zimet's analysis in one respect at least is close to that of Gittell: "The inescapable reality of decentralization is the imbalance of power between the Community School Board and the central Board of Education."[188]

Rubin conducted an official inquiry into the 1973 Community School Board elections. Turnout was only 10 percent compared with a turnout of 14 percent 3 years earlier. Rubin pointed out that while the districts rival in size many independent school districts in the county, there are no mass media geared to informing residents of the 31 districts on a regular basis. While much discussion proceeds on the assumption that the district lines were drawn to maximize the ethnic character of the electorate, the opposite seems to have been the case. Rubin reports:

> . . . The electorate of many districts does not reflect the ethnic make-up of the school . . . In 21 districts, the majority of pupils are black and Spanish-surnamed. In only 10 districts do blacks and Puerto Ricans form a majority of the overall population.[189]

This political fact weakened the representativeness of decentralization.

ELSEWHERE

During 1966-67, a small-scale undertaking in decentralization was created in the virtually all-black Woodlawn neighborhood of Chicago. In 1966 the Woodlawn Community Board was formed with equal representation from the Chicago school board, the University of Chicago, and The Woodlawn Organization (TWO). Later, the university relinquished some of its places to TWO, but retained a total of 11 out of 21 places. The next year, an agreement was negotiated to form the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project (WESP). Extremely little is known about the process leading to the negotiations, and apparently the text of the agreement was not published in printed form. The project existed for 3 years.

Armstrong conducted a study to determine whether schools in WESP experienced any growth in academic achievement. Comparing a WESP school (Wadsworth) with a non-WESP school (Scott), she found no significant difference in reading or arithmetic scores. Her conclusion was that "these results may be attributed to the fact that the Woodlawn Experimental Schools Project is not a true experiment in political decentralization because the Chicago Board of Education retains approval-veto power over the entire experimental district and the Woodlawn Community Board."[190] The absence of independent materials on WESP makes an autonomous evaluation impossible.

During the lifetime of WESP, in 1968, Brieland studied the readiness of 380 Woodlawn residents to accept the services of teachers, among other professionals, without regard to race. Both black and white interviewers conducted the inquiries. Respondents were first asked whether they preferred teachers of their children to be of one or another race. They replied as follows:[191]

	Percent of Respondents:	
Preference of respondent	To White Interviewer	To Black Interviewer
Black Teachers	13	55
White teachers	8	10
No difference	79	35

Respondents with racial preferences were then asked whether their preferences might change if they also knew the qualifications of the teachers:[192]

	Percent of Respondents:	
Might change preference	To White Interviewer	To Black Interviewer
Yes	100	69
No	0	31

A very low level of preference for white teachers is evident from responses to the first question. Black adults in Woodlawn were not reticent in devaluing white teachers, although they were much less ready to admit pro-black preferences. Responses to the second question suggest a readiness to consider the merits of a proposal aside from race. (In 1970, parents in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district were asked their racial preferences of teachers. Some 85 percent said it would make no difference to them.)[193]

In Washington, D.C., the Morgan Community School, part of the district's school system, has been headed by an elected board for 7 years. Two different evaluations of educational experience in the school are available. Haskins has reported: "Reading scores went up for both years. (The first year Morgan was one of only six out [of] 176 elementary schools to show an increase.) Math scores went up for both years. Observers felt children were happy, relaxed, and were enjoying learning."[194] Jacoby writes that "standardized reading and math test scores showed a slight improvement between 1970 and 1972, but the school thus far has been unable to reverse the familiar pattern of poor black children falling further and further below national norms with each year they spend in school."[195] As in the case of Woodlawn in Chicago, little is known of day-to-day events in the Morgan classrooms.

In 1969, Pettigrew polled 887 blacks and whites in Cleveland with four questions:

1. Do you think parents should be able to help decide which teachers are hired or kept on in their children's school?
2. Should parents be able to help decide whether a principal is hired or kept on?
3. Should parents be able to help decide what should be taught in the courses?
4. Should they be able to help decide how the school spends its money?

Responses were as follows, in percentages:[197]

	Negroes			Whites		
Item	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't know	No
1. Hire teachers	44	11	45	25	7	68
2. Hire principals	46	9	45	24	7	69
3. Decide courses	46	6	48	29	6	65
4. Spend money	53	12	35	43	7	50

Obviously, blacks are much stronger supporters of one or another form of community control.

Pettigrew probed into possible reasons. He concluded:

> While some of its most avid advocates in the Negro community are militants with separatist leanings, parental control is basically supported by Negroes who seek swift alteration of their local schools by any intelligent program of reform–busing, integration, parental control. If some other educational reform were effectively implemented, much of the Negro sentiment for parental control of public schools might well dissolve . . . But the vast majority of Negro supporters and mild supporters [of parental control] among whites also favor desegregation and apparently view the two types of reform as complementary rather than as alternatives.[198]

Essentially, Pettigrew found that blacks–and to a lesser extent, whites–were very pragmatic on the issue of community control and integration.

A turn towards community control has some historical precedent as does the black community's continued reliance upon integration. The principal battleground of the community control movement was New York City during the late 1960's. Actual control of schools by poor and minority communities, however, was nonexistent. In every instance, crucial areas of governance, employment, and instruction were reserved to the jurisdiction of central authorities. This was equally true of the three experimental districts as well as of their successor local school boards created in 1969 by State law. Nevertheless, numerous parents gained valuable insight into themselves as well as institutional and bureaucratic aspects of schools that had earlier escaped their attention. Educational growth as such could be readily documented in one of the three demonstration districts. Elsewhere in the United States community control was more a subject of literary discussion than an educational reality.

CONCLUSION

Black efforts to assure educational opportunities for their children have operated within a community framework. Historically, a long life of community activism can be traced. Since the early 1950's this tradition has endured. Black communities have been the single most powerful force in the United States on behalf of desegregation of schools.

Evidence from national polls demonstrates this continuing commitment. Even when the opposition to desegregation took on national proportions and gained official governmental endorsement, black opinion held firm. Indeed, black support for busing, if necessary to achieve desegregation and improve educational opportunities, has grown since 1970. Meanwhile, in a small degree, white opposition has abated.

Black support for desegregation, with or without busing, is higher than evident in national polls. In some cases, the support is around the 80 to 90 percent level. Speaking louder than words are the sustained actions in black communities in support of desegregation, especially when educational gains achieved or projected seem under threat. Many commentators have asserted that blacks are becoming disillusioned with desegregation. Evidence cited often turns out to be statements by isolated individuals. Such evidence is not discernible in the black communities on more than an extremely minimal basis.

The segregated character of urban black communities has failed to dampen the desire of blacks to share in the fruits of a common economy. Despite the universal residential segregation, blacks have much more knowledge of white society than whites have of black society. Having had an opportunity at some point to attend nonsegregated schools influences favorably the attitude of ghetto residents towards integration. The reality of deliberate housing segregation assures that sooner or later the adjacent schools will face a change in racial composition. A study of "white flight", however, indicates that: (1) its magnitude is much less than commonly supposed, (2) it has not occurred in a number of cases, and (3) it is not at all inevitable, given certain policies such as countywide school districts as in Florida.

Black parent participation on a policy level is virtually unknown in schools. Available studies show that school systems either ignore the potential contribution of parents or provide token structures for participation which lack real substance. The movement for community control is in part a response to the failure of the schools to desegregate. It also is an expression of an historic effort by black and other minority parents to assert their right to insist upon educational opportunity for their children.

The black community is thus best viewed as activist and increasingly self-conscious of its goals. Sound thinking about the future of American education can hardly proceed apart from this fact.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *New York Globe*, reprinted in *The Gazette* (Cleveland), August 25, 1883, Martin Dann (ed.), *The Black Press, 1827-1890. The Quest for National Identity.* (New York: Putnam's, 1971), pp. 103-104 (emphasis added).

[2] Benjamin Quarles, *Black Abolitionists* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 53.

[3] John W. Blassingame, "Before the Ghetto: The Making of the Black Community in Savannah, 1865-1880," *Journal of Social History*, 6 (Summer 1973), p. 473.

[4] See, for example, August Meier and Elliott Rudwick, "Negro Boycotts of Jim Crow Schools in the North, 1897-1925," *Integrated Education*, 5 (August-September 1967), pp. 57-68.

[5] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Public Knowledge and Busing Opposition: An Interpretation of a New National Survey.* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, March 11, 1973), Appendix 3, p. 6.

[6] Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashur, and Gary W. Shannon, *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis* (Ypsilanti, Mich.,: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967).

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[8] Dumbarton Research Council, *Race and Education in the City of Oakland*, draft, unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Menlo Park, Calif.: Dumbarton Research Council, October 1966), p. 135.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

[10] Eric R. Krystall, Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White, *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern Negroes* (Tuskegee, Ala.: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March 1967).

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 27-28.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

[14] Gary T. Marx, *Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 30.

[15] Eighty-one percent of the sample was registered.

[16] Krystall, Chesler, and White, p. 9.

[17] A. Harry Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967).

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 77

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 71

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 77.

[21] John P. Spiegel in U.S. Congress, 90th, 1st session, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Antiriot Bill–1967 Hearings.* See, also, Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, *Six-City Study. A Survey of Racial Attitudes in Six Northern Cities: Preliminary Findings* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, June 1967).

[22] The Interuniversity Social Research Committee–Chicago Metropolitan Area, *Militancy for and against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer 1967* (Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967).

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 71

[25] Irving L. Allen and J. David Colfax, *Urban Problems and Public Opinion in Four Connecticut Cities* (Storrs, Conn.: Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut, December 1968), p. 53.

[26] Data from ibid, tables 1.8.13 and 1.8.14, pp. 155-156.

[27] Residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant, *Community Attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant: An Area Study. Summer 1967* (New York: Center for Urban Education, July, 1968), p. 72.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 25.

[29] Charles Richard Thomas, *A Study of Lay Participation in the Elimination of De Facto Racial Segregation in a Northern School District* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970), p. 51.

[30] Resource Management Corporation, *Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, February 15, 1972*, III, p. 116. (ERIC ED 058 470).

[31] *Integrated Education*, March-April 1971, p. 53.

[32] *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration 1971-72* (San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972), p. 133.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 128.

[34] *Ibid.*,

[35] *Integrated Education*, November-December 1971, p. 60.

[36] Philips Meyer, "Busing: A Free Press Survey of a Primary Issue: How Blacks and Whites See It–and Why," *Detroit Free Press*, May 7, 1972.

[37] *Integrated Education*, November-December 1971, p. 64.

[38] Jeanne H. Ballantine, Leonard Cargan, and Harden P. Ballantine, *The Threat of Busing: Real or Imagined* (Cleveland, Ohio: Wright State University, n.d.), Table 7.

[39] *Boston Globe*, May 14, 1974.

[40] *Ibid.*

[41] *Boston Globe*, May 13, 1974.

[42] *Integrated Education*, November-December 1974, p. 15.

[43] *Integrated Education*, January-February 1975, p. 9.

[44] Drawn from the pages of *Integrated Education*, 1965-1969.

[45] Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education*, August-September 1964.

[46] *Ibid.*, pp. 37,40.

[47] *Integrated Education*, April-May 1964, p. 7.

[48] Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education*, 2 (August-September 1964), pp. 34-40.

[49] Edward B. Fort, *A Case Study of the Struggle to Secure an Administrative Plan for Eliminating De Facto Segregation in the Junior High School of Sacramento, California* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964), p. 320.

[50] Thomas, *A Study of Lay Participation*, p. 55.

[51] See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Integration in Several Urban Areas," p. 205 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing Hearings*. . . . Part 1, Serial No. 32 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972). See, also, *Integrated Education*, January-February 1971, p. 55.

[52] For an account of the election, see *Integrated Education*, July-August 1970, pp. 58-59.

[53] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "*School Desegregation in Ten Communities* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, June 1973), p. 195.

[54] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Diminishing Barrier: A Report on School Desegregation in Nine Communities* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, December 1972), p. 14.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[56] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "School Integration in Several Urban Areas," p. 209.

[57] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *School Desegregation in Ten Communities*, p. 22.

[58] Paul Ritterband, "Ethnic Power and the Public Schools: The New York City School Strike of 1968," *Sociology of Education*, 47 (Spring 1974), p. 260.

[59] Harold W. Rose, "The Development of an Urban Subsystem: The Case of the Negro Ghetto," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 60 (March 1970), p. 9.

[60] Joe T. Darden, *Afro-Americans in Pittsburgh. The Residential Segregation of a People* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973), p. 45.

[61] Bennett Harrison, "Ghetto Employment and the Model Cities Program," *Journal of Political Economy*, 82, Part 1 (March-April 1974), p. 355.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

[63] Finis Welsh, "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling, *American Economic Review*, 63 (December 1973), p. 899.

[64] Leonard Weiss and Jeffery G. Williamson, "Black Education, Earnings, and Interregional Migration: Some New Evidence," *American Economic Review*, 62 (June 1973), p. 379.

[65] Robert M. Hauser and David L. Featherman, "Socioeconomic Achievement of U.S. Men, 1962 to 1972," *Science*, 185 (July 26, 1974) p. 330.

[66] James S. Coleman, *Race Relations and Social Change* (Baltimore, Md., Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, July 1967), p. 9.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[68] Joe Richard Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation* (Doctoral dissertation. Harvard University, March 1966), p. 23.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[71] William Moore, Jr., *A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child* (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964), pp. 105-106.

[72] Harvey M. Choldin, *First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965.

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[76] Smith and associates, *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area*, pp. 23 and 41.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[78] Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 204.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

[80] Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 64.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[82] Richard Henry Rowland, *Social Contact Between Blacks and Whites and the Relationships to Attitudes in Six Northern Cities* (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1970), p. 65.

[83] Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 76.

[84] *Ibid.*, p. 147.

[85] Brink and Harris, *The Negro Revolution in America*, p. 197.

[86] Thomas James Kelly, *White Press/Black Man. Analysis of the Editorial Opinion of the Four Chicago Daily Newspapers Toward the Race Problem: 1954-1968* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971), pp. 405-406.

[87] Amiel T. Sharon, "Racial Differences in Newspaper Readership," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37 (Winter 1973-1974), p. 617.

[88] Feagin, *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment*, p. 173.

[89] Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 83.

[90] Choldin, *First Year in the Metropolis*, p. 83. See, also, Frank T. Cherry, *Southern In-Migrant Negroes in North Lawndale, Chicago 1949-59: A Study of Internal Migration and Adjustment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965).

[91] Edwin S. Harwood, *Work and Community Among Urban Newcomers: A Study of the Social and Economic Adaptation of Southern Migrants in Chicago* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966), pp. 57 and 175.

[92] Interuniversity Social Research Committee–Chicago Metropolitan Area, *Militancy for and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago*, p. 22.

[93] Moore, *A Portrait*, p. 174.

[94] Bonnie Louise Bullough, *Alienation Among Middle Class Negroes: Social-Psychological Factors Influencing Housing Desegregation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968) University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 517): and "Alienation in the Ghetto," *American Journal of Sociology*, 72 (1966-1967) 743.

[95] Bullough, "Alienation in the Ghetto," p. 474.

[96] Bullough, *Alienation Among Middle-Class Negroes,* p. 183.

[97] *Ibid.*, 187.

[98] Bullough, "Alienation in the Ghetto," pp. 474-475.

[99] *Ibid.*, p. 478.

[100] *Robert L. Crain and others, The Effects of De Facto School Desegregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities,* unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966), p. 76. See, also, Robert L. Crain and Carol Sachs Weisman, *Discrimination, Personality, and Achievement, A Survey of Northern Blacks* (New York: Seminar Press, 1972).

[101] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[102] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 82. In general, see Schwartz, *Trends in White Attitudes Towards Negroes.*

[107] *Ibid.*, pp. 89,92.

[108] See tables in *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* II, pp. 218-220.

[109] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[110] See appendix C5. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* II, pp. 221-241.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 224.

[112] *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* II, p. 208.

[113] Niilo E. Koponen, "The Myth of a 'Tipping Point' " *Integrated Education,* 4 (August-September 1966), p. 13.

[114] S.B. Cochran and Thomas M. Uhlman, "Black Populations and School Integration – A Research Note," *Phylon*, 34(March 1973), p. 45.

[115] Luther Munford *Black Gravity: Resegregation in 30 Mississippi School Districts* (Senior thesis, Princeton University, April 16, 1971), p. xi.

[116] Luther Munford, "White Flight from Desegregation in Mississippi," *Integrated Education,* 11(May-June 1973), p. 20.

[117] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[118] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[119] See entries under "Mississippi" in "Chronicle of Race, Sex, and Schools" in issues of *Integrated Education* since 1971.

[120] Harold Kurtz, "Court Mandated Integration and White Flight in Los Angeles County," p. 1426 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing Hearings* . . ., Part 3, Serial No. 32 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972).

[121] See *Integrated Education,* May-June 1974, p. 11.

[122] James Bosco and Stanley Robin, "White Flight from Court-Ordered Busing?" *Urban Education,* 9 (April 1974) p. 98.

[123] Edmund W. Gordon, "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," *IRCD Bulletin,* November 1967, p. 3.

[124] Thaddeus J. Lubera, Assistant Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, March 7, 1951, quoted in Helen E. Amerman, *The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954), p. 139.

[125] Frank Riessman, *Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1955), p. 137 (emphasis in original). University Microfilms Order No. 13,999).

[126] Smith and others, *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area,* p. 59.

[127] Passow, *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System,* p. 69.

[128] William Moore, Jr., A Portrait: *The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child* (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964), pp. 178-179.

[129] Raymond L. Jerrems, *A Sociological-Educational Study of a Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965), p. 85.

[130] De Berry and Agger, "School and Race in Portland," p. 14.

[131] William W. Wayson, *Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966), pp. 170-171.

[132] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[133] Neal Gross, Walter O. Jewell, III, Ralph G. Lewis, and Eigil D. Pederson, "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Schools with Pupils from Families of Low Socio-Economic Status," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1966, p. 18.

[134] Clifton D. Hollister, *Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8277).

[135] *Ibid.*, p. 60.

[136] *Ibid.*, p. 151.

[137] Charles E. Garth, *Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools,* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966), p. 31.

[138] James A. Sartain, *Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation* (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966), p. 136 (University Microfilms No. 66-10,999).

[139] Richard Schmuck and Margaret B. Luszki, *A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities* (No place: No publisher, no date).

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[141] Edna O. Meyers, "Self-Concept, Family Structure, and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys," (abstract) (New York: Northside Center for Child Development, n.d.)

[142] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[143] *Ibid.*

[144] Morris Rosenberg, "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Conceptions," *Sociometry,* March 1963, p. 49. See, also, Rosenberg, *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.)

[145] Robert E. Herriott and Nancy H. St. John, *Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals* (New York: Wiley 1966) pp. 42,43.

[146] Joan C. Platoff, *The Effect of Education and Race on the Language and Attitudes Verbally Expressed by Mothers of Preschool Children* (Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967), p. 72. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6165).

[147] Charlotte Jeanette Dunmore, *Social-Psychological Factors Affecting the Use of an Educational Opportunity Program by Families being in a Poverty Area* (Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, p. 161. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-9928).

[148] Prichard, "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," p. 37.

[149] Edward L. McDill, Leo C. Rigsby, and Edmund D. Meyers, Jr., *Educational Climates of High Schools: Their Effects and Sources,* April 1969, p. 27. (ERIC ED 030 205).

[150] *Ibid.* p. 28.

[151] Jeffery A. Raffel, *Responsiveness in Urban Schools: A Study of School System Adaptation to Parental Preferences in an Urban Environment.* June 1972, p. 315 (ERIC ED 063 569)

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 307.

[153] *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 213,288.

[154] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[155] W.M. Phillips, Jr., and others, *Participation of the Black Community in Selected Aspects of the Educational Institution of Newark, 1958-1972,* pp. 137-138, July 1973. (ERIC ED 091-492).

[156] See Governor's Select Commission on Civil Disorder, "Newark's Decaying Public Schools," *Integrated Education,* 6 (March-April 1968), pp. 25-33 and *Integrated Education,* March-April 1975, p.

[157] See Annie Stein, "A New View of Reading Scores," *Integrated Education* 12 (September-October 1974), pp. 20-24.

[158] Dale Mann, "Political Representation and Urban School Advisory Council," *Teachers College Record,* 75 (February 1974), p. 307.

[159] W.E.B. DuBois, "A Negro Nation Within the Nation," *Current History,* 42 (June 1935), p. 270.

[160] Rev. Milton Galamison in Melvin Urofsky (ed.), *Why Teachers Strike. Teachers' Rights and Community Control* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1970), p. 299.

[161] Quoted in Carolyn Woods Eisenberg, *The Parents Movement at I.S. 201: From Integration to Black Power, 1958-66: A Case Study of Developing Ideology* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1971), pp. 150-151.

[162] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 174.

[163] *Quoted in ibid.*, p. 199.

[164] *Ibid.*

[165] Marcia Guttentag, "Children in Harlem's Community Controlled Schools," *Journal of Social Issues,* 28 (1972), p. 8.

[166] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[167] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[168] Judith Kleinfeld, "'Sense of Fate Control' and Community Control of the Schools," *Education and Urban Society,* 3 (May 1971), p. 296.

[169] Kenneth Douglas King, *Attitudes on School Decentralization in New York's Three Experimental School Districts* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1971), p. 72.

[170] Quoted in Susan F. Feinstain, *The Movement for Community Control of Schools in New York City* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1971), p. 342.

[171] Babette Edwards, "Trouble in I.S. 201," *Integrated Education,* 9 (July-August 1971), p. 23.

[172] *Ibid.*, p. 24. See, also, Eisenberg, *The Parents Movement at I.S. 201,* pp. 344-345.

[173] Rhody Arnold McCoy, Jr., *Analysis of Critical Issues and Incidents in the New York City School Crisis 1967-1970 and their Implication for Urban Education in the 1970's,* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1971), p. 9.

[174] Fainstein, *The Movement for Community Control of Schools in New York City,* p. 33.

[175] McCoy, *Analysis of Critical Issues*, p. 141.

[176] *Ibid.*, p. xii.

[177] *Ibid.*, p. 142

[178] Frances Gottfried, "A Survey of Parental Views of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Experiment," *Community Issues,* 2 (October 1970), p. 16. For an account of the 1968 poll findings, see Naomi Levine and Richard Cohn, *Ocean Hill-Brownsville: School in Crisis. A Case History* (N.Y.: Popular Library, 1969), p. 110.

[179] King, *Attitudes on School Decentralization,* pp. 170-171.

[180] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

[181] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[182] *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92. See, also, Shin Ya Ono and Vickie Gabriner, "'Community Control' at Two Bridges: What Went Wrong?" *Leviathan,* June 1969.

[183] Quoted in Melvin Zimet, *Decentralization and School Effectiveness. A Case Study of the 1969 Decontralization Law in New York City* (N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1973), p. 137.

[184] Marilyn Gittell and others, *School Boards and School Policy. An Evaluation of Decentralization in New York City.* (N.Y.: Praeger, 1973), p. 157.

[185] *Ibid.*, pp. 162-163.

[186] Zimet, *Decentralization and School Effectiveness,* p. 148.

[187] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[188] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[189] Max J. Rubin, *Community School Board Elections in New York City: A Report to the New York State Commissioner of Education* (Albany: State Education Department, 1973).

[190] Marjorie Armstrong, *Community Participation by Blacks: Its Relationship to School Achievement* (Master's thesis, Northeastern Illinois State University, 1971), p. 30.

[191] Donald Brieland, "Black Identity and the Helping Person," *Children*, 16 (September-October 1969), p. 172.

[192] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

[193] Gottfried, "A Survey of Parental Views," p. 8.

[194] Kenneth W. Haskins, "A Black Perspective on Community Control," *Inequality in Education*, No. 15 (November, 1973), p. 32.

[195] Susan Jacoby, "Community Control *Can* Work," *Learning*, 2 (December 1973), p. 53.

[196] Thomas F. Pettigrew, *A Study of School Integration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1970), p. 254.

[197] *Ibid.*, p. 255.

[198] *Ibid.*, pp. 363-364.

CHAPTER 11
SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN IN SCHOOL

Senator Walter F. Mondale, chairman of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, addressed a public hearing conducted by his committee in 1970:

> We had . . . hearings on the educational problems of Mexican Americans, who comprise the second largest minority, six million. The TV cameramen broke their legs trying to get out of the room when we turned to the subject. I decided that the fastest way to empty a hearing room was to announce hearings on Mexican American education problems.
>
> But I have now found a way to clear a hearing room even faster, and that is to disuss Puerto Rican education problems.[1]

The Senator was not exaggerating much.

Indeed, had he looked carefully, Senator Mondale might have seen another small band of men and women "fleeing" the hearing room: educational researchers. The literature of research is almost devoid of extended studies of the educational problems of Mexican American and Puerto Rican children. Many of the existing writings call attention to problems rather than provide active examinations of them. Indeed, the single most extensive study of Mexican American children and their difficulties in school was made not by university or independent researchers but directly by a Federal agency – the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The aforementioned 1970 Senate inquiry into educational problems of Puerto Rican children was the largest then on record.

Much of the existing literature on Spanish-speaking children in school is debilitated by two characteristics: (1) a sweeping inattention to the historical framework of the subject and (2) a strong tendency to reduce school problems of Spanish-speaking children to defective values held by the children and their parents. One can be easily freed from the constraints of the past by ignoring them. This usually, however, results in exchanging old for newer constraints. Institutional deprivation and segregation, feeding on deep historic roots, cannot be ignored out of existence. All but a few of the major educational problems of Spanish-speaking children can be understood as consequences of historical forces. These forces include cultural facts, such as language and world view; poverty and discrimination are further recurrent features of this same historic experience. A study of values cannot substitute for an empirical examination of the actual conditions under which children learn or do not learn. It makes little sense to attribute poor academic achievement to the so-called cultural value of *machismo* (manliness) or to low *n* Ach (motivation to achieve) without analyzing the constrictive role of history and law or the active contribution of community and teacher bias.

In the remainder of the chapter studies of the situations of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican children are dealt with separately, under headings equivalent to the sections of the preceding chapters: (1) historical background, (2) legal framework, (3) race and intelligence (4) possibilities of learning, (5) learning in the classroom, (6) desegregation and achievement, (7) being oneself, (8) students and fellow students, (9) teachers and their students, and (10) the community and the schools. In some instances only one study or no study is available. This is especially true for Puerto Rican children.

MEXICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In historic America, centuries before the common schools of New England, the Aztecs and other Indian nations created the earliest public schools. The Spanish conquerors destroyed them as preservators of traditional culture. After some 300 years of conquest, Mexico became independent in 1821. Popular education did not become a reality for any large numbers, especially if they were poor, during the rest of the century.

As a consequence of the war of 1846-48, Mexico lost one-third its territory to the United States. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo legalized this immense transfer of land and provided that Mexicans who chose to remain under American rule could practice their own religious rites and exercise other cultural rights. Concentrated almost entirely in the State of Texas after the mid-19th century, Mexican Americans enjoyed few civil rights and suffered widespread exclusion from community resources. Schools regularly refused to enroll their children. By 1900 or so, here and there, they were permitted to attend only 'Mexican" schools. These officially segregated schools were established by explicit school board action.[2] Even during the 1920's, many Texas towns refused admittance of Mexican American youths to high schools. Except for a tiny group of wealthy Mexican Americans, educational opportunities did not exist. California in the 1920's and 1930's segregated the Mexican American children. Segregation within formally desegregated schools was familiar. Sometimes, for example, graduation ceremonies for Anglo and Mexican American eighth graders were held on separate days.

Denigration of Spanish and Mexican culture was the rule in schools of the Southwest. Penalties were levied on students who were apprehended in the act of speaking Spanish on school premises. State law sometimes forbade the use of a "foreign" language, even to teach English (Texas). A State law intended to encourage teachers to be bilingual was ignored (New Mexico). Before World War II higher education was virtually unknown to Mexican American youth. A few colleges were established to train future teachers for Mexican American elementary schools.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Legally, Mexican Americans were not subjected to discriminatory racial laws such as those related to blacks. Nor were they given the privileges accorded whites. In Texas, they lacked the rights held by immigrants from European countries. In 1921, for example, the school board of Coryell County, Tex., refused to permit a Mexican American child to attend school because his parents were not citizens. Upon appeal, State school authorities overruled the decision. In 1928, a local action to segregate Mexican American students on the ground of race was similarly reversed. Two years later, the State's supreme court approved segregation on academic grounds but not for racial or ethnic purposes. Racial segregation went on. In California, Mexican Americans were defined by law as Caucasians; between 1930 and 1947, they were held by the State to be Indians. In 1947 a Federal court in California outlawed the segregation of Mexican American children as violating the separate-but-equal interpretation of the 14th amendment. The principle of segregation remained intact.

The *Brown* decision of 1954 had no effect on schooling for Mexican Americans. Indeed, as Gerry, a Federal civil rights enforcement official, has written: "...Between 1954-1970 neither the courts nor the executive branch seriously attacked either the segregation of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Native American children or the invidious discriminatory practices utilized by school districts in the operation of educational programs within schools."[3] Already by the late 1960's, however, pressure on the Federal Government to move in this area came from Mexican Americans in the Southwest and from Puerto Ricans in New York. Chicano school boycotts in California, Texas, and elsewhere, pinpointed demands for equal treatment as well as for enforcement of protective laws.

Chief among these was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For several years, title VI which forbade the discriminatory use of Federal funds on the grounds of national origin as well as race or color, lay in disuse as far as Spanish-speaking children were concerned. In 1969, Federal authorities began to explore possible action. The next year, HEW's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued a memorandum, "Discrimination and Denial Due to National Origin." It reported that "Title VI compliance reviews conducted in school districts with large Spanish-surnamed student population . . . have revealed a number of common practices which have the effect of denying equality of educational opportunity to Spanish-surnamed pupils."[4] School districts were placed on notice: "Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students."

Between 1970 and 1974, the courts established a number of important guidelines. In *Cisneros,* in 1970, a Federal district court ruled that Mexican Americans constituted an "identifiable ethnic minority with a past pattern of discrimination" in Corpus Christi, Tex. Later, a Federal appeals court upheld *Cisneros.* In *U.S.* v. *Texas Education Agency,* regarding Austin, Tex., the same court declared: "We see no reason to believe that ethnic segregation is any less detrimental than racial segregation." When school districts proved unable to draw up effective programs to remedy the ethnic discrimination, Federal courts frequently directed educational specialists to produce a comprehensive educational plan. In *Keyes,* involving Denver, Colo., the U.S. Supreme Court in 1973 spoke on the issue for the first time. It held that "Negroes and Hispanos in Denver suffer identical discrimination in treatment when compared with the treatment afforded Anglo students." Thus, school authorities could no longer claim a black-Hispano school as desegregated. In the lower courts, to which *Keyes* was remanded by the Supreme Court, an educational plan for a bilingual-bicultural program was made part of the final order.

In 1974, the Supreme Court reversed a lower court and held in law that "students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education." Relying upon the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the aforementioned 1970 OCR memorandum, the high court directed the San Francisco board of education to offer Chinese-speaking students sufficient special instruction to enable them to pursue further education meaningfully. Mexican Americans were not mentioned in the decision because of non-involvement in the specific case. Ultimately, however, they would become its principal beneficiaries.

By 1975, Mexican Americans had gained the status of an autonomous ethnic group, sharing with blacks special constitutional protection. Having suffered a common fate of planned deprivation and segregation, both minorities could summon up legal weapons which until recently either did not exist or remained unenforced. The burden of meeting unique educational problems was shifted from the individual parent to the school system. As in recent desegregation rulings, the new law respecting Mexican Americans required evidence of actual results rather than policy declarations of belief in equality. "Purposeful design" to deprive children no longer had to be demonstrated. Only effects would matter. The attainment of extended legal protection was an undoubted achievement. How faithfully the protection was translated into practice remained to be seen.

RACE AND INTELLIGENCE

Sociological and psychological writings of the 1920's, 1930's and part of the 1940's were rife with assertions of the intellectual inferiority of Mexican Americans.[5] IQ test scores suffused the argument, much as in the case of anti-black and anti-immigrant movements. (See chapter 3.) Since the mid-1940's an ethnic basis to a purported intellectual deficit has not been pressed. Instead, intellectual inferiority of Mexican American children has been posited as an aspect of the group's poverty. In this sense, socioeconomic status replaced race.

THE POSSIBILITIES OF LEARNING

The impact of language differences on IQ scores has drawn considerable attention in the literature. Extreme cases are clear. Those whose sole language is English are not customarily tested in Spanish, nor do those whose only language is Spanish take tests in English. However, the representative Mexican American child is bilingual in varying degrees of competence. Since IQ tests are not tailored to the individual child's language abilities, a test wholly in Spanish or English fails to reveal the child's abilities. Beyond the language of the test is its logic and structure. These aspects are not narrowly verbal but cultural in character. Native

Americans who take IQ tests constructed in English may still be penalized because of disparities of previous life experiences. IQ test scores reflect social class differences. (Chapter 4 explores this subject more fully.) Thus, verbal, cultural, and class factors may be at work in the IQ score.

Another element to the considered is the basic concept which is used in reporting IQ test results – the normal distribution of scores. This term refers to the probability that intelligence is distributed in a large population along a bell shaped curve; that is, most are in the middle and relatively few at the low and high extremes. The theory of the normal distribution is based on statistical probability, not ethnic or racial capacity. Thus, it is not statistically "normal" for Anglo children to crowd the upper end of the distribution and for Chicano children to cluster at the lower end – nor the other way around. The repeated finding that minority children score below Anglo children is a warning that nonrandom factors are at work.[6]

Galvan analyzed the handicap imposed upon Mexican American child by the failure to use Spanish language testing instruments. He experimented in a Dallas school with 100 Mexican American third, fourth, and fifth graders. They came from the same neighborhood. Each student took the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) in two versions – English and Spanish. Here are the mean scores, by sex:[7]

	N	Mean age in years	Mean score English full scale IQ	Mean score Spanish full scale IQ
Boys	50	9.38	87.80	99.20
Girls	50	9.51	92.48	104.84
TOTAL	100	9.44	90.14	102.02

The distribution of all the scores by IQ group was as follows:[8]

IQ Range		English WISC	Spanish WISC
130+	Very Superior	–	2
120-129	Superior	–	5
110-119	Bright normal	1	15
90-109	Average	57	60
80-89	Dull normal	28	11
70-79	Borderline	11	5
69-below	Mentally defective	3	2

The same order of increase was found in a comparison of English-Spanish differentials on verbal and nonverbal subscores in the tests.[9]

A somewhat similar study was made by Davis and Personke in Victoria, Tex. 88 Mexican American children scored about the same on Spanish and English forms of the 'Metropolitan Readiness' Test. In "word meaning," however, the children scored significantly higher on the Spanish form. The researchers conclude that language as such is not the critical element in the test performance of bilingual children. They suggest as possibly more important that the test resonate with "the experiential background" of the child. This view would seem to cast considerable doubt on the practice of the school system in grouping first-grade entrants "according to judged ability to use English." The researchers state that such a conclusion is not necessarily warranted.[10]

Vogler studied possible discrimination in a pictorial test of intelligence. His subjects were 108 Mexican American and Anglo first graders in Tucson, Ariz. He found that socioeconomic status accounted for more of the differences between the groups than did ethnic membership. The Deviation Intelligence Quotient of the test used in the study "tends to discriminate against children from the Mexican American and lower socioeconomic status cultures. . ."[11]

Chandler and Plakos studied the placement of 47 Spanish-speaking children in classes for the educable mentally retarded in California. English and Spanish editions of WISC were used. Scores by IQ groups were as follows:[12]

IQ scores	English WISC	Spanish WISC
100+	–	2
90-99	–	6
80-89	3	19
70-79	22	16
Below 70	22	4

The higher scores registered on the Spanish version are especially impressive inasmuch as the children involved were originally classified as retarded. Median scores rose from 70 on the English WISC to 83 on the Spanish WISC. Chandler and Plakos note: ". . . Some [of the children] have spent as long as 3 years in a 'special' class and as such may not have received the same advantages as pupils with comparable IQ's in regular classes; the 'special' placement may have been a retarding influence."[13]

Armstrong investigated IQ test bias among 63 students attending Pima College and the University of Arizona. The nonrandom sample, consisting of equal numbers of black, Indian, and Chicano students, was asked to classify intelligence test items according to their cultural appropriateness. Three degrees of bias (high, intermediate, and low) were established empirically and two conditional degrees of bias (H and L) indicated. A control group of Anglo students was selected.

The 45 test items were classified as follows by the students:[14]

Rating	Indians	Blacks	Chicanos
H	1	2	2
H	10	5	3
I	18	16	11
L	14	6	12
L	2	16	17

On five items, students from two or three ethnic groups gave directly opposite ratings.

Armstrong then interviewed the students to elicit their reasons for attributing bias to an item. They listed seven reasons:

1. Verbal facility
2. English vocabulary
3. Thing-oriented, not action-oriented
4. Specialized knowledge
5. Culturally irrelevant
6. Excessively formal logic
7. Tricky question

Since the Anglo control group consisted of only 10 students, Armstrong did not attempt to develop a too fine comparison.

The role of language differences in testing has been explored by several investigators. Vasquez declares that "in English or Spanish, a test conceived with Anglo, middle class subjects in mind is biased culturally against the Chicano child."[15] He adds that the cultural element in a test cannot be neutralized by translation. A similar point has been made by Bertau and Clasen who studied the differences in test scores arising out of the administration of a standard personality test in this country (English) and in Venezuela (Spanish). They explained that the translation was all but literal: "... The items were written taking as a prime consideration the grammatical similarity of the translated words and sentences, instead of trying to culturally adapt the construct behind the original American items."[16] In a formal sense, the two versions were the "same." But they functioned very differently. The researchers report, for example, that "25 percent of the Venezuelan correlation indices are in the opposite sign to the one obtained in America." Comparability of the two sets of responses was not improved even when the test results were weighted differently in Venezuela. Clearly, words as such are minor elements in cultural intercommunication.

Havassy analyzed an inter-American series of Spanish-language tests. Her criticism is severe:

> The Spanish directions, in what may be proper Puerto Rican Spanish are a poor choice of words from the point of view of Southwestern United States Spanish speakers ... The words are a poor sampling of words in common usage and choice appears to be biased towards the words to which an upper middle class child would have the greatest possibility of being exposed ... The Spanish version is a straightforward literal translation of the English version and not a parallel form.[17]

She questions the cultural appropriateness of the tests. In the absence of further information, it is difficult to appraise Havassy's critique. Yet, the type of criticism she makes rarely appears in the literature.

Moreno takes the view that intelligence testing with bilingual children is inappropriate since they are not equally proficient in both languages. If schools offered bilingual curricula in which the children could succeed, the language factor might recede into insignificance. In the absence of such opportunities, as at present, a culture-fair test for bilingual children, insists Moreno, must be scored on norms based on the performance of these children.[19] This position seems to be only a step away from the viewpoint already expressed in chapter 4: the acceptability of the child, not of the test, is the real issue.

LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM

During 1970-74, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published the findings of its comprehensive six-volume Mexican American Education Study. It is the most far-reaching treatment of the subject yet reported. Much of the material on academic achievement is included in volume two, on educational outcomes.

Reading levels among students in five southwestern States in terms of the percentages of each ethnic group reading at average or above grade level follow:[21]

	4th grade	8th grade	11th grade
Anglos	74.7%	71.8%	66.3%
Mexican Americans	48.7	35.8	37.4
Blacks	44.1	41.7	30.3

Repetition of first grade by Mexican American children is nearly double that of blacks and almost triple that of Anglos. Rates of grade repetition and other academic shortfall among Mexican Americans are much lower in California than in Texas.

School holding power is sharply differentiated by ethnic group. Of 100 children in each of the three ethnic groups in the Southwest who began first grade, 23.8 percent of the Anglos, 8.3 percent of the blacks, and 5.4 percent of the Mexican Americans had completed college–years later. Comparing California and Texas, Anglos find the latter more favorable; the minorities fare better in California. Following is a compilation spanning first grade through entry into college; figures are stated in percentages:[23]

	Anglo:		Mexican American:		Blacks:	
	Calif.	Texas	Calif.	Texas	Calif.	Texas
Grade 1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
8	100.0	100.0	93.8	86.1	93.7	98.8
12	85.7	85.1	63.8	52.7	67.3	64.4
Enter College	46.9	53.0	28.2	16.2	34.0	26.7

Given this compilation it is not surprising that after high school graduation minority students are twice more likely to enlist for military service than Anglos.

An earlier study of education in the Southwest was conducted by Grebler and associates in the mid-1960's. Regarding grades, they reported:

> . . . Schools use those grading practices which are felt to be most functional to the projected futures of their pupils . . . The grave dysfunction of particularistic grading is that it obscures the extent of discrepancy between real learning and what is supposed to have been learned.[24]

This phenomenon of a discriminatory, patronizing grade structure is not unfamiliar in the case of other minorities. It was noted earlier in studies of Stockton and Riverside, Calif. and Portland, Oreg. (See chapter 5, p. 61 and chapter 9, pp. 79 and 97)

Payne studied the interrelation of poverty, reading, and ethnic group in the Los Angeles public schools. Reading score averages by attendance district fell as the minority ratio rose. This was, truer of Spanish-surnamed than of black students. The former, Payne reports, "are falling behind in reading at an increasing rate as they advance to higher grades."[25] By 10th grade, the trend is still discernible as reading scores fall along with rising proportions of minority students and translate AFDC recipients. "Indeed," writes Payne, "the coefficient for the Spanish-surnamed variable approaches a near-certain prediction. . ."[26]

Noyola described the problematic situation at J.T. Brackenridge Elementary School in San Antonio, Tex. In preschool classes, according to the researcher: "The children do not speak English at all, and the teachers do not speak Spanish at all. Yet, the classroom activities continue for a whole school year."[27] In the school as a whole, Mexican American children constituted over 99 percent of enrollment. Most lived in a nearby public housing project. Only one out of five teachers could understand and speak Spanish. Noyola found little to say about academic achievement in the school. Cordova sought to discover interrelations among acculturation, achievement, and alienation in a sample of 477 Spanish American sixth graders in 16 schools. Achievement was found to be insignificantly related to acculturation. Indeed, among urban middle class students achievement decreased as acculturational level rose. As for alienation, Cordova wrote:

> Alienation is not learned by a lack of achievement, but rather by cultural conflicts, confusion, insecurity, and meaninglessness. Low achievement is only a symptom of alienation.[28]

Teachers seemed unaffected by students' acculturation when formulating achievement expectations.

Killian conducted a study over 26 months of 84 Spanish American and Anglo rural kindergarteners and first graders. Children were tested at the outset and nearly 3 years later. Spanish American children began their school careers with "not only . . . a verbal comprehension deficit, but had difficulty with the receptive process in both auditory and visual channels and problems with sequencing and order."[29] At the end of the study, a verbal comprehension deficit remained. They had, however, entirely eliminated a performance deficit on the WISC test of intelligence. On nonverbal measures of IQ, the children scored normally; they were deficient, however, on verbal measures. Their reading progress was deficient but not their arithmetic. Unfortunately, Killian does not report on the content of classroom work over the period. It is thus impossible to ascribe specific outcomes to concrete actions that may have occurred in the classroom.

An intensive case study type of investigation was carried out by O'Neill in Stockton, Calif. The Taylor Elementary School, with almost half of its enrollees Mexican American, had a heterogeneous student body; one-seventh were Filipino and another one-seventh, Anglo. At the time of her study, O'Neill was a fifth-grade teacher. One-third of her class were students she had taught in kindergarten at the same school. She observed of the Mexican American fifth graders: "The greatest loss [since kindergarten] is of Spanish vocabulary and Mexican and Spanish concepts, but this loss is not compensated by commensurate gains in English vocabulary or American culture."[30]

Ramirez studied 115 Spanish-speaking students in two schools of Redwood City, Calif. Of these students, 58 attended a school in which they received bilingual instruction; the others went to a school offering only monolingual instruction. Children were enrolled in kindergarten through third grade. Ramirez found that bilingual instruction had a generally "positive effect . . . on the development of the oral English of Spanish-speaking pupils."[31] But this effect did not become evident until 2 or more years of the study. During the first 2 years, the language performance of the bilingual group was poorer than that of the monolingual group. During the third year, the bilingual group took the lead.

In San Antonio, Tex., MacMillan studied the impact of certain socioeconomic factors on the school achievement of 722 Mexican American, Negro, and Anglo students in 12 schools. Achievement scores correlated significantly with occupation of father, attendance, and intelligence. Comparisons of the three groups were not controlled for socioeconomic status. In an analysis of attendance, MacMillan found that Mexican American children had the best record among the three groups when the temperatures stood at 60°F. As the weather grew colder, however, attendance dropped sharply because of lack of suitable clothing. Yet, "an analysis of variance showed no significant difference between the Anglo and Mexican American attendance means."[32]

Anderson and Safar studied equal educational opportunities in two southwestern communities. In Community A, Indian and Mexican Americans made up 15 percent of the population. Anglos dominated the school board, administration, and faculty. In Community B, minorities constituted 60 percent of the population. Spanish Americans filled four of the five seats on the school board. School board members in Community A were under the erroneous impression that all children were equally encouraged in the schools. In Community B, the board members complained of unequal treatment of students while teachers and administrators believed there were no substantial differences. "Because of this gulf between the communities and their professional education," the researchers observed, "the schools fail to assist the minority child in overcoming his educational handicaps and little is done to offer true equality of educational opportunity."[33] The Mexican American child tends to internalize the community's low achievement expectations for him.

The effects of ability grouping on 491 Anglo and Mexican American sixth grade students in six schools of Albuquerque, N. Mex., were studied by Sarthory. The effects were related much more to social class and IQ than to ethnicity. In general, ability grouping tended to reinforce existing trends: It deflated already low occupational aspirations and inflated slightly those already high. It also tended to depress already low self-concepts as well as depressing slightly the high self-concepts of high IQ students.[34] Sarthory distinguished between the promotion and perpetuation of ill effects upon students. Ability grouping, he found, did not create additional learning burdens for children. "Grouping *does* appear to perpetuate existing social cleavage, however, but along social class lines more than along ethnic lines."[35]

Sarthory states that ability grouping should not be practiced in interethnic schools: "New methods of creating school attendance districts need to be developed. Present practices tend to perpetuate social and economic cleavages which are reflected in residential segregation."36

Anderson and associates studied classroom climates in three schools in the area of El Paso, Tex. Area 1, near Juarez, Mexico, almost adjacent to El Paso, Tex., contained many poor immigrants who spoke Spanish almost exclusively. Area II, nearer the city proper, had fewer Mexicans; more English was spoken; fathers typically had some formal education and were employed in jobs requiring a degree of skill. Residents of Area III were for the most part born in the U.S.; their predominant language was English; families were smaller, and the household heads were far more educated than those in the other areas. The schools of each area were distinctive. In Area 1, for example, were found those "teachers who express more positive attitudes toward the disadvantaged [and] also express more positive attitudes toward students in general."37 On the other hand, while "teachers dominate the verbal behavior in [all] the classrooms studied," teachers in Area III are engaged in direction-giving to a much greater extent than are teachers in the other two areas."38 Teachers who stress academic interests were concentrated in Areas I and II.

Winther and associates traced the educational fortunes and misfortunes of the entering freshman class of 1963 at the University of N. Mex., 5 years later. A sample of 189 (over 10 percent of the class) was distributed as follows by 1968:39

Status	Spanish surnamed	Other
Graduated	24.4	30.8
Currently enrolled	6.1	8.1
Dropped out	69.5	61.1

Spanish-surnamed students made up 15.7 percent of all resident students at the university.40 The researchers note that dropouts and failures are socially "invisible"; they simply disappear without any substantial interest shown by university authorities. Winther and associates call this an "open-bottomed" system.41 "The tradition and trend are service to the 'winners' and forget the 'losers' . . . Those who come and for any reason 'do not make it' are largely left to their own devices and are explained after the fact, if at all, by 'they didn't belong here in the first place."42 In 1975, special measures were being developed toward corrective action in this area.43

DESEGREGATION AND ACHIEVEMENT

In 1972, 2,414,179 Spanish-surnamed children attended public schools in the United States. Of these, 1,050,700 or 43.6 percent were enrolled in predominantly Anglo schools; 568,055 or 23.5 percent went to schools where minority students made up from half to 79.9 percent of enrollment; and 795,423 or 32.9 percent attended schools in which minority students constituted 80 percent or more of enrollment. (See table in chapter 6) If desegregation is defined in accordance with the newer legal conception of Mexican Americans as making up an autonomous ethnic group, then only the first group – consisting of a scant 44 percent of all Spanish-surnamed students – attends desegregated schools. Surely, however, part of the second group were in schools that would also qualify as desegregated. Almost certainly none of the schools attended by the third group would so qualify. A related point is worth noting. Until the early 1970's, court desegregation orders did not ordinarily require that Mexican Americans be placed in formerly Anglo schools instead of just in formerly black schools as was the practice of school boards. Very few of the aforementioned first group of Spanish-surnamed students therefore found themeselves in predominantly Anglo schools as a result of a deliberate school board decision to desegregate.

In the Southwest as a whole, a high degree of segregation exists. Nearly half of all Mexican American students attend somewhat over one-tenth of the region's schools. Concentration is most extreme in Texas where the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found that "40 percent of all Mexican American pupils are in schools that are nearly all Mexican American."44 Far less isolation exists in New Mexico and California. Often, predominantly Mexican American districts and schools are adjacent to predominantly Anglo districts and schools. Unfortunately, the Commission on Civil Rights did not compare academic achievement in segregated and nonsegregated schools.

It will be recalled that after the first year of court-ordered desegregation in San Francisco the reading and mathematics achievement gains of Spanish-speaking students exceeded those of blacks. Both groups, however, gained considerably less than white children. (See chapter 6, p. 141) In Riverside, virtually the same results were reported (See chapter 6, pp. 147-154) Studying 1,681 Mexican American junior high school students, Kimball found that their academic achievement was directly related to the percent Anglo in the school. The desegregation effect, according to Kimball, is one of the most important influences on their achievement, being exceeded only by parental factors.[45]

BEING ONESELF

In Los Angeles, Calif., Derbyshire studied identity crisis among Mexican American adolescents. He found that identification with Mexican culture served "as an integrative technique for reducing adolescent identity and role-conflict."[46] Those who do not identify are more education minded, and experience fewer school failures and arrests. They regard school as a way of getting ahead and tend to blame themselves when things go wrong. The more Americanized peers are near the other pole. Thus, concludes Derbyshire, ". . . forced acculturation of minorities by the dominant group may be dysfunctional for adequate and accurate integration of dominant value orientations and behaviors."[47]

Support for Derbyshire's conclusions is found in Kimball's study of 1,681 junior high school students in Los Angeles. He reported:

> . . . A substantially higher proportion of the Mexican American students born in Mexico achieve high grades than those [Mexican Americans] born in California or the Southwest . . . Those pupils reporting the highest level of family use and knowledge of Spanish also receive the largest proportion of high grades. . .[48]

Kimball was puzzled by this finding. In explanation, he speculated that "a process of ghettoization takes place, in which the longer a family line remains in the large segregated Mexican American communities of the Los Angeles area, the more inward grown they become and less inclined to acculturation and achievement in the Anglo culture."[49]

Similarly, Sanchez found in a study of the Lee Mathson School in San Jose, Calif., that self-concept seemed more stable among first-generation than second-generation Mexican Americans.[50] At the Franklin Elementary School in Berkeley, Calif., Lopez writes, "although most of the first-generation Chicanos in Franklin's bilingual class could make the crucial identification with their *raza* and *familias*, the majority of second-generation children were painfully ashamed of their cultural heritage."[51]

Malry studied aspirations of Anglo, Mexican American, and Negro 9th and 12th graders in Albuquerque, N. Mex. The Mexican American families were the poorest. Of the three groups, Mexican American students had the lowest self-image; they feel "that they just can't learn, and . . . that they could do better in school if only the teacher would not go so fast."[52] Absolute educational aspirations are low and related to social class. One exception is the inverse relationship of college-going aspirations to social class.[53] There was some indication that the educational aspirations held by Negro and Mexican American parents for their children declined between 9th and 12th grades.[54] If so, this might be a reflection of increasing realism as the actuality of job seeking approached.

Heller studied 165 Mexican American male high school seniors in Los Angeles.[55] Her primary interest was in the occupational ambitions of the young men and the means they envisioned for achieving the goals. Mexican American aspirations were like those of Anglos, especially when social class was equated. The former, however, have considerably more realistic conceptions of what they expect to get.

Heller divided her sample into two groups:

98 boys in two predominantly Mexican American schools (segregated)

67 boys in six predominantly Anglo schools (integrated)

Aspirations to nonmanual occupations were expressed by 64 percent of the later and 49 percent of the former.[56] The two groups were alike, however, in educational expectations. But, declared Heller, "whether the Mexican Americans will move toward the occupational distribution of the population at large depends, among other things, on whether their children will break out of the school ghettos they are now in".[57]

Heller notes that a fundamental reorientation toward formal education has taken place in the Mexican American community in Los Angeles since 1945: "The real breakthrough in the pattern of Mexican American nonmobility was made after the war by the returning GI's. When they started enrolling in college, they were referred to in their community as *locos*, crazy."[58] Previously, such attempts had been regarded as futile. Heller also states that the establishment of a junior college in East Los Angeles had a significant effect.[59]

Realistically, Mexican American youths do not as yet match their aspirations with actual preparation for professional careers; such careers are in fact not readily available to them. Mexican American IQ scores are sharply lower than those of Anglos. When students are equated for social class, however, the gap closes significantly but the difference is still substantial.[60] IQ scores of Mexican American students were found by Heller to vary significantly with size of family; the smaller the family, the higher the IQ. Anglo families being smaller on the average, their IQ's were higher.[61]

Heller probed certain social values traditionally classified as Mexican and others as Anglo. She found in the area of social values that in general: "Mexican American high school seniors . . . largely resemble their Anglo-American peers, especially when the factor of class is controlled."[62] What happened to the Mexican cultural values of defending family honor and of preferring to smooth over disagreements rather than effecting a blunt confrontation? Heller wrote:

> . . . A much larger proportion of Mexican American boys in the "integrated" schools (74 percent) than in the "nonintegrated" schools (55 percent) answered that they prefer to be the kind of person who "never lets an insult to his or his family's honor go by . . ." Among the . . . [integrated], only 42 percent but among the [segregated] 65 percent expressed preference for pointing out real issues to facilitate intelligent arguing over disagreements.[63]

As for belief in individualism and orientation toward the future, some interesting contrasts emerged.

Significantly more Mexican Americans than Anglos "chose to give up the pleasures of the present in order to assure the future."[64] Both groups have about the same order of orientation to the future. Both are devoted to individuality, but not to the point of risking social isolation; the Mexican American boys showed this tendency more than the Anglos.

In Heller's view, "the school socializes the Mexican American boy in mobility values but fails to socialize him in mobility-inducing *behavior*."[65] The capacities of Mexican American youths are left underdeveloped by the schools. Teachers simply do not expect Mexican Americans to learn as much as Anglo children. Indeed, according to Heller, the well-meaning but misdirected teacher "is more likely to be concerned with doing something so that the Mexican American child 'should not feel inadequate' instead of doing something so that the child would *stop* being inadequate."[66]

Sierra Rodriguez studied self concept among 120 Mexican American and Anglo sixth graders in six schools, in the San Diego area. He found that Mexican American self-concept was related directly to the proportion of Mexican Americans in the student body. The researcher reported that Mexican Americans judged themselves by Chicano rather than Anglo standards of comparison: "He sees himself as other Chicanos see him."[67] Braccio, studying 120 low socioeconomic status Anglo and Chicano children in two cities found the latter had the higher school self-concept.[68] Valenzuela studied the records of Chicanos in South High School, Omaha, Neb. (Of the city's 176 Spanish-surnamed high school students, 148 attended this school.) He found no significant difference in self-concept scores between Chicano and Anglos. And, using grades as an indicator of achievement, he found Chicano students "had not a significantly lower grade point average than Anglo students with the same IQ and socioeconomic status."[69]

Linton analyzed certain aspects of 332 Mexican American and Anglo sixth graders from 16 schools in one south New Mexico city. The sample was stratified by socioeconomic levels. On neither general nor academic self-concept did any significant difference emerge among ethnic groups. Far more important were differences in self-concept scores attributable to socioeconomic factors.[70] Gustafson and Owens explored self-esteem among 552 third and sixth graders in five predominantly Chicano schools in urban California. Both Mexican American and Anglo children made up the sample. At the third-grade level, self-esteem did not vary by ethnic group. At the sixth-grade, however, significant differences had emerged and all to the favor of Anglo rather than Mexican American children.[71]

The long-standing policy of prohibiting student use of the Spanish language in classrooms and school playgrounds cannot help but envelop the student's conception of his cultural heritage in an air of illegitmacy and self-doubt. Yet, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found that two-thirds of the Texas schools in its sample discouraged the use of Spanish in the classroom; for the Southwest as a whole the proportion was one-third.[72] The school's own sense of Anglo identification is spotlighted by the Commission's additional finding that "the higher the proportion of Mexican Americans, the greater the probability that the school will have the 'No Spanish' rule."[73] Language prohibitions are not unique to the Southwest. In 1971, Gamboa reported that in schools along the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington, students who spoke Spanish were punished.[74] In Lubbock, Tex., De Leon writes: "Children are no longer spanked if they speak Spanish. Yet they are still told not to speak it . . .[75] De Anda has conceptualized the personal cost of language prohibition in a striking phrase: "In effect, the policy meant that for a time the child had to become functionally mute."[76]

In his extraordinary autobiography, *Barrio Boy*, the scholar Galarza recalls the happier school days of an immigrant boy from Mexico. He attended the Lincoln School in Sacramento:

> Miss [Nettie] Hopley [the principal] and her teachers never let us forget why we were at Lincoln: for those who were alien, to become good Americans; and for those who were so born, to accept the rest of us . . . The school was not so much a melting pot as a griddle where Miss Hopley and her helpers warmed knowledge into us and roasted racial hatreds out of us . . . At Lincoln, making us into Americans did not mean scrubbing away what made us originally foreign . . . No one was ever scolded or punished for speaking his native tongue on the playground . . . It was easy for me to feel that becoming a proud American as she [Miss Hopley] said we should, did not mean feeling ashamed of being a Mexican.[77]

Galarza does not note whether the Lincoln staff invested much emotion in their instruction; indeed, they seem to have been a cool but respectful lot. On the other hand, they created a school climate of helpfulness and acceptance that must have encouraged children of all backgrounds. This decency could not have been consequence of the power of the Mexican American community for it had no such power. Rather, it was a product of an entirely different calculus.

Unfortunately, the Galarza work is an exception in the literature. If there are parallel experiences to report, they should be brought to print promptly. Meanwhile, Palomares' rhetorical questions seems relevant. She first observed that current social science studies frequently turn up data indicating that the Chicano self-concept is as high or no lower than that of an Anglo student . . . "What is gained by educators," she asks "if this [same Chicano] child has 'turned off' the school and the majority culture and as a result does not become equipped to interact effectively in both worlds?"[78] Thus, the goal of self-concept studies in education is not to measure successfully the abstract and free-floating phenomenon called self-concept so much as to inquire into the fate of the whole organism of which the self-concept is only an expression. It would thus seem indefensible to treat high self-concept as an educationally valid substitute for school achievement. Such a procedure would hardly be countenanced for children of the dominant community.

A minor area of research into self-concept relates to the role of skin color. Werner and Evans tested the skin color preferences of 40 4- and 5-year old Mexican American children. Subjects were presented with dolls; "white" dolls had "yellow hair and flesh-toned[!] skin; the Negro dolls had black hair and brown skin."[79] Children who were attending preschool were more "prejudiced" in that they preferred the white doll consistently. They also tended to say the white adult doll was larger than the black one, although both were the same size. When value choices were made, white skin was regarded as good, dark skin as bad.[80] Cota-Robles, in a study of 28 Mexican American Head Start children in Torrance, Calif., probed color preferences. While from half to three-quarters of the children correctly identified their own skin color, nearly three-quarters did not express a preference for the color brown. The researcher asked the children to identify crayons by color, which they did. When, however, they were asked to select a crayon with which to draw an accurate self-portrait, they stayed away from brown. Instead, "they overwhelmingly chose bizarre colors as skin color preference," thus revealing "emotional anxiety and conflict." Cota-Robles concludes that "when the child rejects the dark color, he knows that he must be identified with that which he rejects and, therefore, is in conflict."[81]

At the other end of the academic ladder, Lopez studied the role of skin color in self-preference of college students. His subjects were 168 Mexican American students attending three California institutions of higher education: San Jose State College, Sacramento State College, and the University of California, Davis. Previous studies, according to Lopez, had established a direct relationship between light skin color and assimilation into Anglo culture and found that prejudice against dark skin was a strong factor among Mexican Americans. In his own study, Lopez found that skin color and assimilation were not as directly related as in the past. In fact, among the males in his sample, Lopez found an outright reversal: ". . . The most highly acculturated-assimilated group into the Anglo culture contained the greater proportion of dark Chicano males."[82] At the same time, light-skin preference lost its hold somewhat, especially among more acculturated females.

STUDENTS AND FELLOW STUDENTS

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found Mexican American students in southwestern schools to be underrepresented in extracurricular activities. "This is true," the Commission added, "whether Mexican American constitute a majority or a minority of the student enrollment in a school."[83] Frequently, such a finding has been misinterpreted as though it merely expresses a cultural affinity for clannishness or some other interest. Detailed study of individual cases suggest rather that the role of school policies may be more relevant.

At Lubbock High School, in Lubbock, Tex., for example, the administration is jealous of the school's identification as the "Home of the Westerners." At the same time, Mexican Americans make up 42 percent of enrollment. When over 100 Chicano students asked permission to form a Chicano club, the principal told them: "You cannot be an organized Westerner and an organized Chicano at the same time, so you better choose between the two."[84] At Grant High School in Houston, Tex., where Mexican Americans constitute three-quarters of the student body, Anglos dominate organized extracurricular activities. The principal explained it one way: "These kids totally segregate themselves from the rest of the school."[85] A Chicano student viewed it quite differently:

> We like to do something separate. We want to feel we can do something on our own. It feels bad when people don't talk to you. Some Anglos are nice and talk to you but others don't. A great percentage of the students don't treat us like they should.[86]

Thus, exclusion and separateness are two sides of the same coin.

TEACHERS AND THEIR STUDENTS

The two most significant studies yet made of teachers and their students have already been reviewed – those by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and by Parsons. (See chapter 9, page 47) The first investigation documented highly discriminatory teacher behavior toward Mexican American children, the second provided extensive evidence of the conscious role of the school, including teachers, in maintaining a profoundly stratified community power structure. In Riverside, Calif., Gerard and associates found that Chicano as well as black students were the objects of teacher bias. (See chapter 9, p. 95) The Commission study also touched on a point not discussed elsewhere: that Mexican American teachers praised Anglo students even more than Anglo teachers did. Thus, in classrooms taught by Mexican American teachers, there was an even greater disparity between praise of Chicano and Anglo students.[87]

Lugo studied 96 Chicano and black fifth graders in six predominantly Mexican American schools located in Los Angeles County. Quite unexpectedly he found that native-born Chicano students received no higher grades than foreign-born Chicano students despite greatly varying language backgrounds separating the two groups. Teacher bias was not operating, apparently, since objective achievement test scores corroborated the earlier finding. Lugo speculated that since "Mexican pupils arrive in the United States with no feelings of shame regarding their cultural heritage," that therefore "positive identification with one's culture is a more powerful motivator for school success than language competency in English."[88] This would imply that the school must reexamine its practices that convert ethnic affiliation into a depressor of academic achievement.

Oakland and Emmer carried out a study of 176 Mexican American and black eighth graders. Subjects were told that the results of a test they were to take would be compared with results recorded by various reference groups. They were then requested to indicate their own expectancy of success in the test. (See chapter 4, p. 20 for similar experiments with black subjects.) In general, performance remained unaffected by the norm group designations. Black students, however, did respond with changed expectations. What struck the researchers more than the effect or noneffect of the information was "the unexpected inability of many students . . . to perceive accurately their capabilities. . ."[89] Perhaps the most valuable feature of this study is the realization of how fruitless is the search for teacher effects if only the race of faculty changes.

In January, 1972, police in Arroyo Grande, Calif., arrested 26 Chicano students and parents who were demonstrating peacefully across the street from Arroyo Grande High School. They had called for:

1. School district participation in the Federal school lunch program. (Authorities had rejected earlier requests for 3 consecutive years.)
2. Increase in number of Mexican American teachers.
3. Employment of a school-community relations specialist.
4. Placement of material on Mexican American life in teacher inservice training programs.
5. Involvement of organized parents in school affairs, beyond present nominal roles.

Following the events of January, faculty at the high school were polled on their views of the demonstration and demands. Results were as follows:

> The teachers did not, by a 2-1 margin, feel that the students' demand for more Mexican American teachers was a legitimate one.
>
> While a majority of teachers agreed that there was a need for faculty and administration to meet with Mexican American parents in their own communities, more than half. . . stated that they would not be willing to take part in such meetings.[90]

The temper of the dominant community was reminiscent of that of Guadelupe as discussed in Parsons' study.

Keeping one's distance from the Chicano community seemed to keynote the teachers' primary orientation. Social distance was maintained even in the face of physical contact. As the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported of its survey of the Southwest: "Counselors had a difficult time remembering parents with whom they had had contact."[91]

THE COMMUNITY AND THE SCHOOLS

Mexican Americans are all but excluded from the policy levels of southwestern schools. During the early 1970's, only six members of State boards of education in the region were Mexican Americans.[92] Central staff members are overwhelmingly Anglo. The same holds true on local levels. In one city in Texas, 539 persons were employed in five high schools. Of these, 11 were Chicanos; 8 of the 11 were janitors; 2 were teachers, and 1 was a part-time coach.[93]

The 1960's were years of important transition in the relation of the Chicano community to the schools. Most significant were the student-led "blow-outs" and school boycotts of 1968-1970. Largest of these was the March 1968 boycott in Los Angeles. Highly revealing was the community-wide character of this action and others like it. In Los Angeles, 6 months of community meetings were devoted to drawing up demands.[94] Where actions began under student direction they frequently broadened out to the whole community. The demands were quite modest in their own right. Most popular were demands for courses in Chicano history, employment of more Mexican American teachers and counselors, and special academic help where needed. The official response, however, was disproportionate in its use of arrests, violence, and similar approaches. This was by no means the first time that Mexican Americans protested. As Garcia pointed out, one large national group – The GI Forum – filed over 200 lawsuits in the 25 years preceding 1973 in efforts to stop school board discrimination against Mexican Americans.[95]

"... Migrancy between cultures," Galarza wrote, "is far more damaging than migrancy between jobs."[96] It is not the movement of migrancy but its inescapable uprootedness that has made the traditional rural way of life hardly more than a memory. The migrant farm laborers, Galarza stated:

> . . . Have been acculturated by extrusion. What comes through the mold are those ways of doing things that are practically useful to the superculture. What is permitted to remain unmolested is the quaint, the harmless, or the amusingly exotic. To the supercultural it can be fun eating tacos or listening to mariachis. But the ancient attitudes and the old values that are as to tacos as dawn is to a flickering match, have no currency any more.[97]

But as the migrancy pattern loosened its hold, a basis was laid for community stabilization and thus a greater possibility for concerted action.[98] It was this underlying process that created elbowroom for a Chicano movement as well as a heightened drive among others for assimilation. The schools have yet to come to terms with these new cultural realities.

PUERTO RICANS

Until the close of the 19th century, under Spanish rule, education in Puerto Rico was more or less confined to those sufficiently wealthy or influential to obtain it. After the conquest of 1898, calls for public education were turned aside by the American government which refused to allocate public land funds or direct money appropriations. Instead, the worldwide colonial model was used. That is, education depended upon local contributions with the colonizing power restricting itself primarily to imposing its own broad cultural definitions on the content of that education. Although Puerto Rico remained extremely poor under American rule, it strained to finance an adequate school system. The Puerto Rican tax burden for education exceeded by far that which prevailed on the mainland.

Nevertheless, a certain quantitative progress was recorded. At the onset of the 20th century, only about one-twelfth of the Puerto Rican school-age children were in school. Some 40 years later, nearly half of all Puerto Rican school-age children were enrolled; among elementary school-age children, nearly 70 percent attended schools.[99] Unfortunately, the quality of education did not keep pace. In 1961, when nearly all elementary school-age children were enrolled, more than 60 percent attended for only 3 hours a day. In 1967, just under half of rural students still attended for less than a full day.

While the persistent shortage of schools remained the critical problem for many years, another complicating factor was the sporadic insistence of American authorities that instruction in schools be conducted in English. The presence of a large rural population which would never participate in the urban commercialized world militated against such a policy. English was of no use to them. Aside from the inessentiality of English, however, the political implications of the English-only policy grew in importance.[100]

Puerto Ricans, legally citizens of the United States since 1917, did not come to the mainland in large numbers until the early 1950's. For a decade or so, they moved to New York City in preference to any other mainland city. Between 1956 and 1965, Puerto Rican students rose from one-eighth to one-fifth of the public school enrollment.

While many of the children could not speak English, neither could many of their teachers speak Spanish. Instead of narrowing the gap by adjusting both sides of the equation, school authorities defined the children's language deficiency as a barrier to further education. No significant action was taken to effect a substantial improvement in the language ability of teachers or staff. In this standoff, the school system refused to give way.[101]

Retardation of Puerto Rican children became a way of life in the New York City school system. Many were poor and had difficulty with English. These two features transmogrified their situation into a theory of cultural deprivation. Failure by the schools to deal effectively with Puerto Rican children was attributed to vaguely diagnosed home conditions. During the mid-1950's, Puerto Rican children in 10th grade whose parents were born on the mainland scored 8.0 years against a national norm of 10.6. (Non-Puerto Rican mainland white children scored 8.6 years.) Island-born children, on the other hand scored 4.9 years and island-born but mainland-educated scored 7.1 years.[102] Clearly, the achivement tests were firmly dependent on language ability. By 1969, the situation was a serious as ever. Citywide reading scores for predominantly Puerto Rican schools were as follows:[103]

Grade level	Percent below grade norms
Second	72
Fifth	82
Eighth	81

In other cities, exceedingly low achievement levels and extraordinarily high dropout rates were recorded.[104]

Rodriguez notes that "throughout many decades of mass migration, the school system of New York City has been guided by the imperative of assimilation."[105] A large-scale study by the school board, completed in 1958, failed to recommend bilingualism even though it went into great detail on language problems of the Puerto Rican child.[106]

Weissman studied communication patterns of 37 Puerto Rican and Negro children and their mothers on the Lower East Side of Manhattan. The subjects were interviewed at home and in a neighborhood settlement house. Mother-child relations of Puerto Ricans were much less stressful than for Negroes.

> ... Close to 60 percent of the Puerto Rican mother-child pairs leave the Center holding hands or very near one another. This pattern is not in evidence for the Negro group ... The Puerto Rican mothers are much less critical and the children less anxious and restless ... The Puerto Rican mothers and children showed a much more active pattern [of play] with at least two times as many praise and pleasure interactions.[107]

Weissman observed numerous negative admonitions to their children by Negro mothers.[108]

At home, differences were also apparent.

> ... [There was] heightened group interaction of children and parents in the homes of the Puerto Rican group. Group singing, often of religious songs, was a more frequent occurrence. When present [at the interview], Puerto Rican fathers more often cooperated and joined in the games, while Negro fathers tended to remain in the background.

Both Puerto Rican and Negro families were living at the poverty line.

Hertzig and associates compared aspects of cognitive functioning among 3-year-olds of working class Puerto Rican and middle class mainland white backgrounds. Each of the children had been studied since the age of 3 months as part of a larger longitudinal study.[109] The researchers knew the children very well and excellent rapport existed. "... The preponderant response in both groups of children to cognitive demands [in a testing situation] was to work."[110] While IQ score differences of Puerto Rican and mainland white children were statistically significant, the researchers considered these "probably functionally trivial."[111] In characterizing the styles of the two groups, Hertzig and associates stated: "Perhaps the most pervasive difference between the two groups was the tendency of the middle class children to respond to the cognitive demands by verbalization much more frequently than by action or gesture."[112] No evidence was found to explain this difference by the bilinguality of the Puerto Rican children.[113]

In a word, the middle class children were far better prepared to succeed in school. Their parents emphasized task orientation and task completion. On the other hand, in the Puerto Rican homes social interaction rather than task completion was stressed. Puerto Rican children tended to respond less often to cognitive demands with work responses; they tended to make fewer spontaneous extensions; and they tended to follow not-work responses with not-work behavior. There was no lack of conversation in the Puerto Rican homes. The researchers warned: "If the patterns described continue to define the developmental course of the two groups of children, they can result only in a much enhanced likelihood for school failure and underachievement in the Puerto Rican children, and for school success in the middle class children."[114]

Thomas, a member of the Hertzig team, also reported separately on another aspect of the long-term longitudinal study mentioned earlier. His interest was the intellectual development of 45 Puerto Rican children. Their greatest intellectual handicap was a reading deficit. This could not be explained by any feature of the home. Thomas found "no consistent relationship between parental child care practices or educational attitudes and the children's reading deficits."[115]

> ... The basic causes of the reading deficit found in most of these Puerto Rican children must be sought outside the home. The parents manifest a high degree of interest and involvement in their children's school careers. They are concerned about academic achievement. Yet even those children in the normal range of IQ and higher are reading below grade level. It would appear that the main source of the reading deficit is not the home but the school.[116]

Two-thirds of the parents want their children to finish college, only about one-third expect them to do so, and only one-fifth have specific plans for financing college attendance.[117]

The everyday environment of these Puerto Rican children is experientially rich. Their intellectual ability does not decline over the years, even in the absence of suitable educational opportunities. Yet, one must compare Thomas' basic point with that made by Hertzig and associates. The latter noted that "differences in behavior between middle class and Puerto Rican children develop long before exposure to formal learning in school or experience in nursery school."[118] They predict school failure if certain trends are not changed. Thomas apparently disagrees with this orientation but he does not take explicit issue with it.

Greene and Zirkel found that self-concept of Puerto Rican students was higher when they constituted a majority in a school. In another study, however, they found this effect depended in part on the ethnic group of the teacher. Thus, in a sample of 337 Spanish-speaking students, grades one, two and three, in three Connecticut cities, they found that "English-speaking teachers tended to rate the Spanish-speaking children higher when they were in a majority in school whereas the Spanish-speaking teachers showed a significant lack of such a reaction. . ."[119] Layden, in a study of 56 third graders in a virtually all Puerto Rican school within the New York City metropolitan area, investigated the effect of language of instruction. Both English and Spanish were used but each teacher used only one. Student self-concept did not vary with language of instruction, although children taught in English achieved significantly more than those taught in Spanish.[120] It should be noted that bilingual instruction was not involved in the sense of the same teacher shuttling between the two languages. Nor was the study a test of regular classroom situations; the study covered only a period of 10 weeks.

Rodriguez conducted a study in New York City of 52 Puerto Rican community college students and working adults. She employed the concept of an "ethnic queue" and observed that Puerto Ricans in American society were socially defined as occupying a rear rank in the queue. All but a few of her sample reported they knew of discrimination against Puerto Ricans in jobs and schools. But perception of the ethnic queue did not automatically follow. Knowing of individual acts of discrimination and perceiving their place in an ethnic queue were quite different matters. "Generally," Rodriguez found, "the most significant variable affecting perception of the queue was exposure beyond the ghetto-ized situation of most respondents."[21] The ghetto undoubtedly moves some individuals to leave and "make it" outside. But Rodriguez notes that "it also stifles possible group mobility."[122] The ghetto is thus part of the structure of the queue just as public school teachers "are direct enforcers of queue ideology."[123]

In some parts of the United States, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans are known collectively as Latinos. In others, relations may not be so accommodating. Of interest are the attitudes of these two groups on racial segregation and desegregation. National polls generally reveal both to stand in the middle or nearer black than Anglos. (See chapter 10.) In 1974, Development Associates, Inc. studied Chicano and Puerto Rican attitudes on the issue of desegregation. Interviews were conducted in Los Angeles, San Antonio, New York City, and Washington, D.C.

In general, Mexican Americans were found to be favorable to desegregation. According to the researchers, behind this attitude lay a conviction that "desegregation would improve the quality of education provided their children . . . The attitude of Mexican American parents toward school desegregation is summed up by the overwhelming approval they have given to sending their children to desegregated schools."[124] Confidence in desegregation is heightened, however, by the incorporation of bilingual-bicultural programs. Puerto Ricans tend to differ as to the effect of desegregation on educational quality. In addition, the researchers report they believe strongly in "retaining children in elementary schools located in their neighborhoods regardless of the school's ethnic composition."[125] Skin color plays a somewhat different role in Puerto Rican society than on the mainland. Racially segregated schools never existed on the Island. As Rodriguez says of the Island: ". . . Though whites may be preferred, blacks are not considered lesser human beings."

CONCLUSION

Comparatively little research has inquired into the education of Mexican American and Puerto Rican children.

Historically, Mexican Americans were excluded from the benefits of public schooling or when admitted, compelled to attend segregated and inferior facilities. Their language and other cultural characteristics were devalued. Legal protection for their educational rights did not begin materalizing until the past decade. Action by Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, has acknowledged the ethnic autonomy of Mexican Americans. Unlike during the 1920's and 1930's, Spanish-surnamed children are no longer subjected to open charges of intellectual inferiority on the presumed basis of race. Yet, language differences are frequently converted by schools into learning barriers.

Ability and achievement test scores of Chicano children are clouded by language differences and by social bias on tests. Often, a change in language will permit minority children to score higher. Mere translation into Spanish will not, however, cure the problem of a test that is constructed in the image of the Anglo upper class. Achievement data as reported by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights document the sweeping failures of schools in the Southwest especially, to educate Chicano students. Experience of Chicano children under desegregation has not been evaluated very extensively. Evidence is not encouraging although it must be kept in mind that we are evaluating desegregation as it is practiced rather than as it might be.

Mexican American aspirations are high but these are not consonant with the low achievement recorded in the schools. Cultural denigration has lessened but in many schools the use of Spanish continues to be frowned upon and actively discouraged. Chicano children participate infrequently in extracurricular activities, even in predominantly Mexican American schools.

Many teachers of Chicano children in the Southwest discriminate against them in the classroom. Extensive firsthand observation supports this conclusion. Recently, Chicano communities have organized to demand a new receptivity of the schools to the educational problems of their children. For their own part, college and high school level students have taken a leading role in this movement. At the center of these developments is a consolidation and stabilization of Mexican American communities. Atop these is developing a new consciousness of the Mexican American as both a unique and common member of the larger community.

The educational problems of Puerto Rican children derive basically from a colonial relationship. On the Island, Puerto Ricans were exhorted to educate their children but external aid, essential to success, was withheld for decades. Arriving in New York City poorly educated and speaking what was culturally defined as a "foreign" language, the Puerto Ricans came face-to-face with the schools' refusal to regard language differences as educational challenges rather than barriers. Wholesale failure became one expected outcome if not the norm. Failures of achievement were widely attributed by teachers and staff to unspecified aspects of students' homes rather than to any action or inaction by the schools. There is no reason to believe this absolution of the schools to be more defensible than the situation with regard to black children discussed in chapter 5.

FOOTNOTES

[1] U.S. Congress, 91st, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Opportunity, Hearings . . . Part 8 – Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children* (Wash. D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970), p. 3795.

[2] Jorge C. Rangel and Carlos M. Alcala, "De Jure Segregation of Chicanos in Texas Schools, *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, (March 1972), pp. 307-391.

[3] Martin H. Gerry, *Cultural Freedom and the Rights of La Raza*, March 3, 1972, p. 4.

[4] *Integrated Education*, July-August 1970, p. 53.

[5] Nick C. Vaca, "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences 1912-1970. Part I: 1912-1935," *El Grito*, 3 (Spring 1970), pp. 3-24.

[6] See Frank Ortega, "Special Education Placement and Mexican Americans," *El Grito*, 4 (Summer 1971), p. 31.

[7] Robert Rogers Galvan, *Bilingualism As It Relates to Intelligence Test Scores and School Achievement Among Culturally-Deprived Spanish-American Children* (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967), p. 35.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 36 and 38.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[10] O. L. Davis, Jr. and Carl R. Personke, Jr., "Effects of Administering the Metropolitan Readiness Test in English and Spanish to Spanish-Speaking School Entrants," *Journal of Education Measurement*, Fall 1968, p. 233.

[11] James Donald Vogler, *The Influence of Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status on the Pictorial Test of Intelligence* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968, p. 69.) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11,833).

[12] John T. Chandler and John Plakos, "Spanish-Speaking Pupils Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded," *Integrated Education*, 7 (1969), p. 30. See also Nelson Diaz-Mora, *The Availability and Adequacy of Some Spanish Translated Tests* (Master's thesis, Western Michigan University, 1969). (University Microfilms Order No. M 1832).

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[14] Roy Anthony Armstrong, *Test Bias from the Non-Anglo Viewpoint: A Critical Evaluation of Intelligence Test Items by Members of Three Cultural Minorities*, (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1972), p. 54.

[15] James Vasquez, "Measurement of Intelligence and Language Differences," *Aztlan*, 3 (Spring 1972), p. 158.

[16] Patrick Berto and Robert E. Clasen, "An Analysis of a Spanish Translation of the Sixteen Personality Factors Test," *Journal of Experimental Education*,

[17] Barbara Havassy, "A Critical Review of the New Inter-American Series," pp. 57-59 in Bay Area Bilingual League, *Bilingual Testing and Assessment*, 1972. (BABEL, 1414 Walnut Street, Room 13, Berkeley, Calif. 94709.)

[18] O. L. Davis, Jr. and Carl R. Personke, Jr., "Effects of Administering the *Metropolitan Readiness Test* in English and Spanish to Spanish-Speaking School Entrants," *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 5 (1971), p. 234.

[19] Steve Moreno, "Problems Related to Present Testing Instruments," *El Grito*, 3 (Spring 1970) p. 27.

[20] All six volumes were published by the U.S. Government Printing Office in Washington, D.C. Their titles and dates of publication are as follows: (1) *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest* (August 1970 and April 1971); (2) *The Unfinished Education. Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States* (October 1971); (3) *The Excluded Student. Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest* (May 1972); (4) *Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth* (August 1972); (5) *Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students* (March 1973); and (6) *Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans* (February 1974).

[21] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Unfinished Education*, p. 25.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 15, 19.

[24] Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman, *The Mexican-American People. The Nation's Second Largest Minority* (N.Y.: Free Press, 1970), p. 169.

[25] Joseph F. Payne, "Race, Reading, and Poverty in Los Angeles," *Integrated Education*, 9 (November-December 1971), p. 19.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 20

[27] Arnaldo Jaime Noyola, *Psychosocial and Academic Factors Associated with Elementary School Dropouts in the Barrios of San Antonio* (Master's thesis, University of Texas, 1972), p. 60.

[28] Ignacio Ruben Cordova, *The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement, and Alienation Among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1969), p. 99.

[29] L. R. Killian, *Cognitive Test Performance of Spanish-American Primary-School Children: A Longitudinal Study*, November 1971, p. 12 (ERIC ED 060 156).

[30] Elizabeth Ford Stone O'Neill, *Mexican American Children in the Process of Acculturation* (Master's thesis, University of the Pacific, 1968), p. 26.

[31] Arnulfo G. Ramirez, *The Spoken English of Spanish-Speaking Pupils in a Bilingual and Monolingual School Setting: An Analysis of Syntactic Development* (Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1974), p. 116.

[32] Robert Wilson MacMillan, *A Study of the Effect of Socioeconomic Factors on the School Achievement of Spanish Speaking School Beginners* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1966), p. 224.

[33] James G. Anderson and Dwight Safar, "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," *Sociology of Education*, 40 (1967), p. 230.

[34] Joseph A. Sarthory, *The Effects of Ability Grouping in Multi-Cultural School Situations* (Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968), p. 137 and

149.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 203.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

[37] James G. Anderson, William H. Johnson, and Robert Lange, *Mexican-American Students in a Metropolitan Context: Factors Affecting the Social-Emotional Climate of the Classroom*, July 1969, p. 28 (ERIC ED 030 521).

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 35 and 38.

[39] Sven F. Winther, E. Bruce Potter, and William H. Huber, *A Longitudinal Study of the Beginning Freshman Class of 1963 at the University of New Mexico. The Invisible Student*, May 1969, p. 24. (ERIC Ed 030 532.)

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[43] On means of increasing the number of Chicanos on college campuses, see the helpful materials in Everett D. Edington, *Recruitment of Spanish-Speaking Students Into Higher Education*, May 1969 (ERIC ED 031 320); Anna Nieto Gomez and J. Anthony Vasquez, *The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus*, May 1969 (ERIC ED 031 323); and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Proceedings, *National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican Americans*, 1968 (ERIC ED 031 345).

[44] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Ethnic Isolation*, p. 27.

[45] William L. Kimball, *Parent and Family Influences on Academic Achievement Among Mexican-American Students* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968), p. 220

[46] Robert L. Derbyshire, "Adolescent Identity Crisis in Urban Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles," p. 108 in *Minority Group Adolescents in the United States*, ed. by Eugene B. Brody (Baltimore, Md.: Williams and Wilkins, 1968).

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 73-110.

[48] Kimball, *Parent and Family Influences*, pp. 99, 124.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 217.

[50] Armand J. Sanchez, *Self-Concept of Mexican-American Youth: The Stability of Self-Concept of Mexican American Youth in Relation to Mexican Cultural Values* (Master's thesis, Fresno State College, 1967), p. 32.

[51] Josephine Lopez, "Free Compulsory Public Education: The 'Great Equalizer' or the Great Divider?" *Edcentric*, October-November 1972, p. 14.

[52] Lenton Malry, *The Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Anglo, Spanish, and Negro High School Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Univeristy of New Mexico, 1968), p. 52. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8284).

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[55] Celia S. Heller, *Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth. Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors*, (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964) (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11,296).

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 98.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 258.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 117.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 155.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 208.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 197 and 217.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 244 (emphasis added).

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 246 (emphasis in original).

[67] Valerio Sierra Rodriguez, *Mexican American Pupils' Self-Concept in Public Elementary Schools.* (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1972), p. 75.

[68] John H. Braccio, *A Comparative Study of School Self-Concept Between Low Socio-Economic Fifth and Sixth Grade Chicanos and Anglo-Americans* (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971), p.

[69] Alvaro Miguel Valenzuela, *The Relationship Between Self-Concept, Intelligence, Socio-Economic Status and School Achievement Among Spanish-American Children in Omaha* (Field Report, University of Nebraska, Omaha, 1971), p. 44.

[70] Thomas H. Linton, *A Study of the Relationship of Global Self-Concept, Academic Self-Concept, and Academic Achievement Among Anglo and Mexican-American Sixth-Grade Students*, April 1972, p. 6. (ERIC ED 063 053).

[71] Richard A. Gustafson and Thomas R. Owens, *The Self-Concept of Mexican-American Youngsters and Related Environmental Characteristics*, April 30, 1971, pp. 5, 8. (ERIC ED 053 195).

[72] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Excluded Student*, p. 15.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[74] Erasmo Gamboa, *Chicanos in the Northwest: A Historical Perspective*, 1971, p. 15. (Montal Education Associates, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.)

[75] Nephtale De Leon, *Chicanos, Our Background and Our Pride*, 1972, p. 67. (Trucha Publications, P.O. Box 5223, Lubbock, Tex., 79417.)

[76] Diane De Anda, "Chicanito in Checkmate" *Edcentric*, October-November 1972, p. 24.

[77] Ernesto Galarza, *Barrio Boy* (N.Y.: Ballantine Books, 1972)

[78] Geraldine Dunn Palomares, *The Effects of Stereotyping on the Self-Concept of Mexican Americans*, 1970, p. 31 (ERIC ED 056 806).

[79] Norma E. Werner and Idella M. Evans, "Perception of Prejudice in Mexican-American Preschool Children," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 27 (1968) 1041.

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 1043.

[81] Cecilia Cota-Robes de Suarez, "Skin Color as a Factor of Racial Identification and Preference of Young Chicano Children," *Atzlan*, 2 (Spring 1971), p. 138. 138.

[82] Richard Emilio Lopez, *An Investigation of the Interrelationship between Skin Color, Skin Color Preference, and Acculturation-Assimilation Among Chicano College Students* (Doctoral dissertation,

University of California, Davis, 1972), p. 52.

[83] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *The Unfinished Education*, p. 43.

[84] De Leon, *Chicanos*, p. 46.

[85] Mary Ellen Goodman and others, *The Mexican American Population of Houston: A Survey in the Field, 1965-1970*, 1971, p. 70 (ERIC ED 060 997).

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 76. For a comment on a negative aspect of these separate clubs, see Nancie L. Gonzalez, *Positive and Negative Effects of Chicano Militancy on the Education of the Mexican American*, 1970, p. 18 (ERIC ED 061 004).

[87] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Differences in Teacher Interaction*, p. 27.

[88] James Oscar Lugo, *A Comparison of Degrees of Bilingualism and Measure of School Achievement Among Mexican-American Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970), p. 103.

[89] Thomas Oakland and Edmund Emmer, *Effects of Knowledge of Criterion Groups on the Test Performance of Negro and Mexican-American Students*, 1972, p. 10 (ERIC ED 064 379).

[90] California State Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Educational Neglect of Mexican American Students in the Lucia Mar Unified School District, Pismo Beach, California* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, January 1973), p. 14.

[91] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Staff Report, *Research Methods Employed in the Mexican American Education Study* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, October 1971), p. 8.

[92] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans*, p. 37.

[93] De Leon, *Chicanos*, p. 54.

[94] Oscar Zeta Acosta, "The East L.A. 13 vs. the L.A. Superior Court," *El Grito*, 3 (Winter 1970), p. 13.

[95] Testimony of Dr. Hector P. Garcia, in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing Hearings*. . . Part 3, Serial No. 32 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 1515.

[96] Ernesto Galarza, "The Mexican American Migrant Worker – Culture and Powerlessness," *Integrated Education*, 9 (March-April 1971), p. 18.

[97] *Ibid.*

[98] See Rodolfo Acuña *Occupied America. The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation* (San Francisco, Canfield Press, 1972), p. 243.

[99] See Edward J. Berbusse, *The United States in Puerto Rico, 1898-1900* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), p. 141. Juan Jose Osuna, *A History of Education in Puerto Rico*, 2nd ed. (Rio Piedras, P.R.: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1949), p. 626; and Luis Nieves Falcon, *Recruitment to Higher Education in Puerto Rico, 1940-1960* (Rio Piedras, P.R.: Editorial Universitaria Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1965), p. 209.

[100] See Aida Negron de Montilla, *Americanization in Puerto Rico and the Public School System 1900-1930* (Rio Piedras, P.R.: Editorial Edil, 1971).

[101] See J. Cayce Morrison, *The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957. A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York* (New York: Board of Education, 1958); Hector Vazquez in U.S. Congress, 91st, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Opportunity Hearings*. Part 8. *Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Offic, 1970) 3732-3733; Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, *Puerto Rican Americans. The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), p. 147; Hernan Rodriguez, *Some Problems of Bilingualism in Acculturation of Puerto Ricans in New York City* (Master's thesis, City College of New York, 1965), p. 73; and "Instructions for Non-English Speaking Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public School System," February 10, 1971, memorandum for Senator Jacob Javits, in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in New York, February 14-15, 1972* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 631.

[102] Morrison, *Puerto Rican Study*, p. 75.

[103] U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in New York*, p. 246.

[104] See Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *El Boricua: The Puerto Rican Community in Bridgeport and New Haven* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, January, 1973); Richard J. Margolis, *The Losers. A Report on the Puerto Ricans and the Public Schools*. (New York: Aspira, Inc., May, 1968) and Isidro Lucas, "Puertorriquenos En Chicago: El Problema Educativo Del Dropout" *Rican* 1 (May, 1974) p. 5018.

[105] Hernan Rodriguez, *Some Problems of Bilingualism in Acculturation of Puerto Ricans in New York City* (Master's thesis, City College of New York 1965), p. 93. (University Microfilms Order No. M-1153).

[106] See New York City Public Schools, *The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957: A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York* (New York: Board of Education, 1958).

[107] Julius Weissman, *An Exploratory Study of Communication Patterns of Lower-Class Negro and Puerto Rican Mothers and Pre-School Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966), pp. 50,60, and 61. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5551).

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 54.

[109] Margaret E. Hertzig, Herbert G. Birch, Alexander Thomas, and Olga Aran Mendez, *Class and Ethnic Differences in the Responsiveness of Preschool Children to Cognitive Demands* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

[110] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[112] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[113] *Ibid.*, p. 43.

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[115] Alexander Thomas, *Retardation in Intellectual Development of Lower-Class Puerto Rican Children in New York City* (New York: New York University Medical Center, May 31, 1969), p. 61.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[117] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

[118] Hertzig and Associates, *Class and Ethnic Differences*, p. 44.

[119] John F. Greene and Perry Alan Zirkel, *Academic Factors Relating to the Self-Concept of Puerto Rican Pupils*, September 1971, p. 9 (ERIC ED 054 284).

[120] Russell Glenn Layden, *The Relationship Between the Language of Instruction and the Development of Self-Concept, Classroom Climate and Achievement of Spanish Speaking Puerto Rican Children* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1972), p. 126.

[121] Clara Rodriguez, *The Ethnic Queue in the U.S.: The Case of Puerto Ricans* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1973), p. 231.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 301.

[123] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[124] Development Associates, Inc., "Impact of School Desegregation of Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans," pp. 83-84 in Robert L. Crain and others, *Design for a National Longitudinal Study of School Desegregation*, Vol. I. *Issues in Theory and Method* (Santa Monica, Calif., Rand, September 1974). The complete report is printed on pp. 75-95.

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[126] Rodriguez, *The Ethnic Queue*, p. 131.

CHAPTER 12
INDIAN AMERICAN CHILDREN

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Approximately 20 thousand years ago, when the Indians discovered America, they may be supposed to have already worked out a form of traditional education that endured almost until the historic present. In North America, formal specialized schooling did not obtain among the Indians. Instead, there was an exceedingly effective form of instruction aimed primarily toward the perpetuation of the community and its ways of life. Education prepared children for a meaningful place in a collective social organization marked by the primacy of group interest but with due provision for individuality. Religion infused every basic community function and children were educated in this spirit. Since productivity was low, great care was given to training children to take on specific roles in the economy. Technical skills were husbanded as carefully as seed and soil.[1]

The white conquerors ultimately uprooted the community basis of traditional Indian education. By expropriating tribal lands they destabilized customary patterns of land and water use. Here and there, Indians became unfree laborers and were sold into slavery. Settled community life for Indians came to exist more by sufferance than by acknowledged right. Even under these circumstances, traditional education did not disappear. Yet, it tended to lose some of its relevance as the proportions of white conquest became evident. When formal schooling was made available by the dominant society, most often it was welcomed by Indians. But the new opportunity was tempered by whether it became a substitute or a complement to traditional Indian ways.

In fact, "white" schools were most readily accepted where students learned to live in two societies. In turn, however, a bicultural frame- or at least the nonantagonistic coexistence of cultures, was countenanced by the Federal Government only when it was pressed by circumstances to do so. During the 1820's, in an effort to move the Cherokees off cotton land in Georgia and Alabama, the Indians were offered money for their land, part of which was to be used for bilingual schooling. After the Civil War, however, when Federal forces exercised military supremacy over Indians, school clauses in treaties usually specified instruction in English. Often, Federal authorities failed to supply the schools pledged in the treaties. It took nearly a century after the Navajo treaty of 1868 to build sufficient schools to house substantially all the elementary school-age children among the Navajos.[2]

During the past century and a half, Federal policy has been to destroy the Indian heritage and language. Schools were a prime means of accomplishing this aim. Private philanthropic groups, until very recently, pursued the same policy out of an excess of patronization and paternalism. Both government and private groups assumed the Indian himself could be safely ignored in the realm of policy. Since the goal of the Indian schools was assimilative, the educational problems of Indian children were passed over in the effort to convert rather than educate them. "Between 1928 and the early 1970's," writes historian Szasz, "Indian Bureau education failed to develop programs geared to the needs of the Indian people."[3] These years coincide with the period during which the Federal Government shifted the responsibility for

Indian education to the public schools. More than two-thirds of all Indian students today attend public schools. In many respects, this shift from Federal day and boarding schools has not resulted in many significant changes in the education of Indian American children.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

"... In dealing with Indians," writes Cohen, "the Federal Government is dealing primarily not with a particular race as such but with members of certain social-political groups towards which the Federal Government has assumed special responsibilities."[4] Thus, in a legal sense, Indians occupy a unique status. The most basic guideline of Indian law, Cohen continues, "is the principle that those powers which are lawfully vested in an Indian tribe are not, in general delegated powers granted by express acts of Congress, but rather inherent powers of a limited sovereignty which has never been extinguished."[5] In 1871, Congress forbade the making of any further treaties with Indians but affirmed the legality of existing ones. Courts repeatedly declared that these treaties were equal in dignity with those with foreign nations. In fact, however, "the Federal Government failed to fulfill the terms of many treaties and was sometimes unable or unwilling to prevent States, or white people, from violating treaty rights of the Indians."[6] This view was echoed recently in the words of U.S. District Judge Warren K. Urbom who in 1975 decided a case involving claims by Sioux Indians that their treaty, signed in 1868, provided them certain sovereign rights. While he decided against the Indians, he told an interviewer afterwards: "Before I was involved, I was as naive about Indian history as most Americans ... I had the subterranean feeling that we had abused the Indian badly, but I hadn't realized the extent of that abuse."[7]

Finances for Indian education derived primarily not from legislative grants but from trust funds reflecting in part the value of Indian lands expropriated by the Federal Government. In *Quick Bear*, decided by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1908, it was held of the trust or treaty fund:

> It is the Indian's money ... They are moneys belonging really to the Indians ... They are not gratuitous appropriations of public moneys, but the payment ... of a treaty debt in installments.[8]

Except in the case of the Cherokee and four other Southern Indian Nations, Indian control of schools did not result from what was essentially self-financing. While the Federal Government in theory merely disbursed the funds, it in fact exercised virtually complete control over Indian schools.

The exclusion of Indians from public schools was accomplished by statutes and court rulings. In Alaska, Indians and Eskimos were branded by law as uncivilized beings and thus not permitted to attend schools with white children. This law was upheld by courts for a number of years. Through administrative practice and congressional enactment, food rations were denied Indian families if they refused to send their children to government schools, no matter how unsatisfactory those schools might be. Federal courts approved of removing Indian children from the custody of their parents and placement in a boarding school "when the good order and protection of civilized society unmistakably demand it..."[9]

Post-Civil War schooling for Indians was in English only. Administrative regulations forbade the use of Indian languages. This war of the tongues was fought incessantly. As one experienced teacher observed of the children of Fort Yuma, in California: "It was not altogether that English was difficult for them to learn, but they had been taught from earliest childhood to despise their conquerors, their language, dress, customs ...[10]

Indians resorted to courts in an effort to penalize the Federal Government for failing to provide schools as required in treaties. Both the Sioux and the Duwamish sued in the U.S. Court of Claims during the 1920's and 1930's but lost in each case. Curiously, however, the facts of treaty violation were acknowledged. In the case of the Sioux, damages were denied on the ground that no rational means existed whereby they could be exactly reckoned. In the case of the Duwamish, the Government's obligation was merely moral and not statutory.[11] In 1924, the Supreme Court of California ruled that Indian children had a right to attend a public school, even though a Federal Indian school was also available. This decision in *Piper* invalidated a State law which had authorized exclusions.[12] In Oklahoma 6 years earlier, Indians had won a court order in the *Sunrise* case that opened all the public schools to their children.

Public school authorities responded readily to financial incentives to admit Indian children. Too often, however, the funds found their way into the general school budget with few direct gains for the intended beneficiaries. In 1934, Congress enacted the Johnson-O'Malley Act to transfer Federal funds to school districts as supplements to regular State and local school funds. For years, school districts converted the supplementary funds into substitutes for local and State aid, thus contravening the purpose of the law. By the late 1960's, according to historian Szasz, this practice had become "notorious."[13]

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, Congress began to redefine the constitutional status of Indians and passed legislation to permit more Indian control of Indian education. Implementation, however, lagged seriously and so few things actually changed.

The remainder of this chapter reports research under the same subheadings employed elsewhere in the book. It should be kept in mind that the total volume of research in this area is extremely slim.

RACE AND INTELLIGENCE

While reported IQ scores for Indian children are often lower than those for white children, they are almost always in the normal range. This is especially true when specific groups of children are studied at individual schools or localities such as Warm Springs, Oreg., the Onondaga reservation in New York, and the Pine Ridge, South Dakota, Oglala Sioux reservation.[14]

Kleinfeld has explored extensively the cognitive strengths of Eskimos in Alaska. According to her findings, the conditions of Eskimo life laid a premium on the development of certain specific cognitive abilities. Since nature yields so few cues in finding one's way under arctic circumstances, children are trained to notice the slightest topographical or other natural feature for guidance. Eskimos are well able to draw maps of their home areas and adjoining territories. Kleinfeld suggests that because of their well-developed "perceptual analysis and image memory" Eskimos might do especially well in technical and scientific fields.[15] Kleinfeld reports that "Eskimos frequently perform significantly higher than Western groups on psychological tests measuring ability to conceptualize or remember visual detail and sometimes perform significantly higher on tests measuring spatial abilities."[16] It is instructive to note that Kleinfeld is not asserting the existence of an ethnic style of thinking so much as a human response to given environmental conditions. Presumably, Caucasian children reared similarly would develop similar cognitive characteristics. (On the subject of ethnic intellectual style, see chapter 4, pp. 32-61)

Feldman and associates arrived at analagous findings in making a comparative study among Eskimos in Alaska and among certain other ethnic inhabitants of Hawaii and Kentucky. The researchers view "logical thought as a product of man's adaptation to his environment."[17] The schools Eskimos attend pay little heed to this psychological principle. Rather, they begin with the child's inadequate mastery of English and fashion the curriculum to match this declared deficit, much as public schools elsewhere have done with Spanish-surnamed children. The researchers observed:

> The curriculum in Eskimo schools seems much lower powered than is usual in high schools. There are virtually no hard core academic courses in which a child might acquire technical languages. Many children take no science at all, and many are distressed because they cannot take mathematics each year. It is clear that there is little opportunity for the children to acquire formal representational systems.[18]

In the light of Kleinfeld's comment it would seem the schools are bypassing the area of intellectual competence which might have special meaning for Eskimo children. The boredom of Eskimo children in school, according to Feldman and associates, probably reflects a lack of material that would stimulate their cognitive capacity even as intensely as their everyday experience requires.

Doubts as to the educational validity of IQ scores grow upon examining the study by Jensen of 21 children attending the Pryor Public School on the Crow Indian reservation in southeastern Montana. The children spanned grades one through four, and Jensen was their teacher. Although the children did not especially enjoy school, Jensen reported they "were usually bright, eager, alert, independent, and feisty."[19] Yet, when given the Stanford-Binet IQ test, they scored an average of some 30 points below norm. During the year of teaching the same children, Jensen declared, "there were too many times the children reacted intelligently for the test scores to be a true indication [of their intelligence]."[20]

She then administered a battery of the Gesell Developmental Examination to the children. The papers were sent to be scored at Montana State University. Some were then sent to the Gesell Institute in New Haven, Conn., where the tests had originated. There, a staff person reported to Jensen that the scores were "too high." Upon being rescored several months later by another institute member, however, it was now decided the papers had been scored too low in the first instance. This conflict moved Dr. Frances L. Ilg, senior author of the tests, to visit the Crow reservation and readminister the examination. "She said," according to Jensen, "they (the children) were average developmentally in most areas, and that they were above average in a few areas."[21] Over the year, the Crow children showed a bit more than 1 year's growth, the average national gain. Puzzled by the disparate evaluations of the children by the Stanford-Binet and the Gesell, Jensen could only guess that the former test was created for middle class Americans and thus was inappropriate for lower class Indian children. One might add that, judging by the scoring experience, the Gesell is also problematic.

ACHIEVEMENT

As the poorest people in the United States, Indians are considered the fairest game for theories that explain their children's low school achievement as the inevitable consequence of poverty. Perhaps the clearest defense of that deterministic viewpoint has been stated by Havighurst: "... When speaking of school achievement, socioeconomic facts could lead us to expect that Indian children, on the average, will do poorly in school right from the start, and right on through their childhood and adolescence."[22] He explains further: "Since most Indian children are raised in poor families, by parents who read little or not at all, and since most Indian children live in communities of poor people, we should expect them, like the children of poor whites, or blacks, or Spanish Americans, to do poorly in school, on the average."[23]

In chapters 4 and 5 this view was discussed as it applied to black and other minority children and found wanting in several respects. Through use of developmental measures, socioeconomic differences in basic mental ability are sharply reduced or even eliminated. Numerous studies have found lower class children of similar socioeconomic circumstances who differ significantly in school achievement.

In a study of 108 Indian children in four towns and 108 white children in a fifth town – all in Oklahoma – Purdy measured associative learning rates. Second and fourth grade children of the two ethnic groups did not differ in ability. In sixth grade, however, Indian children were behind the whites. To Purdy, the lag can probably be attributed to the cumulative burden of semi-isolation and deprivation that makes its presence felt with force by sixth grade.[24] (This phenomenon is discussed later in more detail.)

Anderson, Collister, and Ladd studied Indian academic achievement in the continental United States.[25] They found that the greater the contact of Indian children with the white man's culture, the higher their scores on educational tests.[26] Indian academic achievement was highest in public schools, and lower in the following order: mission, nonreservation boarding, reservation boarding, and day schools.[27]

A much more pointed and detailed study was made 5 years later by Coombs, Kron, Collister, and Anderson.[28] Altogether, the study covered 26,608 pupils (17,255 Indian, 9,353 white) in six geographical areas; the children were overwhelmingly rural. California Achievement Tests (CAT) were administered. Results were presented in group averages, so there was no opportunity to determine relative achievement by individual matching; no controls were used. Nor was there any effort to control socioeconomic status.

White fourth and fifth graders achieved near the norm on CAT; soon thereafter gains for both Indian and white children started falling. As time went on, the Indian-white achievement gap grew. In the tests, "Indian pupils compared best in spelling and least well in reading vocabulary."[29] Academic achievement was higher if English were spoken prior to school entrance, if the degree of "Indian blood" was lower, and if the child lived off rather than on the reservation. Unfortunately, there is no way to tell whether the achievement was high because of living off the reservation, or whether one lived off the reservation if one had higher achievement. In the case of one area (Andarko), Indian children achieved about the same in the Federal school as white pupils in the Albuquerque public schools. (Many of the latter were Mexican Americans.)

Learning variation under different conditions of ethnic mixture is of some interest. The Coombs team found that:

> Fourth graders attending "mostly white" schools [in Aberdeen] were higher on the average on total score than those attending "mostly Indian" schools. . . .In the Billings area. . . seventh grade pupils attending schools which were "half Indian, half white" scored higher on the average than those in the "mostly Indian" schools.[30]

Reviewing all their data on the issue, the team concluded: "There is a slight indication that Indian pupils attending public schools enrolling a large proportion of white pupils achieve better than those attending public schools with mostly Indian pupils but the evidence is by no means conclusive."[31] This conclusion was somewhat ahead of the facts, however. Since initial individual differences were not controlled, it is not altogether clear how much of the outcome should be attributed to the schooling experience.

The researchers were interested in discovering patterns of relations between Indian and non-Indian. They found that the Indian children in public schools – and thus in the best situation to select friends from among non-Indians – still chose by far the greatest number of their friends from among other Indian children. This was true in Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Aberdeen areas. The non-Indian students of Albuquerque were unique in one respect: Many of them were Mexican Americans of whom a little more than one-third (34.8 percent) had spoken only English prior to entering school.[32] In this respect they resembled Indian children. They scored lowest of all non-Indian children, but higher than all Indian children in the area. The Coombs team raised but did not attempt to answer a speculative question as to whether these Mexican American children "exercised less acculturation influence on their Indian classmates in the public schools than did their non-Indian contemporaries in the other areas."[33]

High achievers tended to be high aspirants to further education. An inconsistent trend was observed for whites to aspire higher during the lower grades and for Indian children to do so by the 11th and 12 th grades.[34]

Griffen studied the Southern Ute people in southwestern Colorado.[35] She sought to discover whether a child's family structure had an influence on his ability to learn in an integrated school. She found that "the grade level at which a student does his best work correlates with the structure of his family orientation, and that the more extended the family is beyond nuclear, the more deferred will be the peak school performance achieved by the individual socialized therein."[36] Griffen had studied Ute, Anglo, and Mexico American children in a school in Ignacio, Colo., near Durango.

Bryde studied the Oglala Sioux at Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.[37] A review of IQ and achievement scores of the youngsters there revealed a distinctive pattern. During the first 3 years of school on the reservation, the Sioux student is normal in intelligence but quite far from the norm on achievement tests; at the end of the third grade, the achievement lag is one-half grade to one-and-one-half grade. In fourth grade, the Sioux child suddenly enters a "golden age" of higher than norm achievement, which lasts until seventh grade or eighth grade. At that point, a sudden drop in achievement occurs, and by 12th grade, "most Indian groups are as far as 2 years behind in achievement."[38] Bryde described this sharp reversal as the "crossover phenomenon." He hypothesized that "the impact of the Sioux-white value conflicts, occurring primarily during the period of adolescence, creates in the Sioux student adjustment and personality deviations which, in turn, hamper achievement."[39]

Bryde studied three groups of Indian students, all attending schools on a reservation, and two groups of white students who attended public schools in small towns adjacent to the reservations:

164	Indian students who were eight graders in eight schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
159	Indian students who were ninth graders in two high schools on Pine Ridge Reservation.
92	Indian students who were seniors at two high schools on Pine Ridge and adjacent Rosebud Reservations.
415	
76	White students who were eight graders in small-town public schools.
126	White students who were ninth graders in small-town public schools.
202	

All children filled out the Minnesota Multiphasic Personal Inventory (MMPI).

Analysis of the inventory replies showed Indian Students significantly higher than whites in "social alienation, emotional alienation, self-alienation, social isolation, anxiety, and depressions."[40] It is not clear whether, as Bryde states, the Indian students have a higher need to achieve.[41] A summary figure shows no significant difference between Indian and white need to achieve;[42] yet, separate figures show Indian boys and girls with a higher need to achieve than their white counterparts.[43]

Indian 12th graders are a select group; 60 percent of Indian students drop out before that time. On MMPI scores, the 12th graders "show themselves to be more comfortable with the world, more self-assured and self-confident," than Indians in earlier grades.[44]

Bryde, then, views the educational plight of the Sioux student as the outcome of a culture conflict, with serious personality consequences. This conclusion is closely in line with a recent Federal Government report.

> For some time, determined efforts were made to destroy the many cultures of the Indian on the ground that they were major deterrents to full membership in our society. Schools were the institutions charged with this destructive function. As a result, a few Indians made the traumatic adjustment but many more did not.[45]

Bryde has proposed a new curriculum for Indian education which aims at building confidence in the Indian culture.[46]

Dilling made a study of Indians in Ontario.[47] In May 1963, he administered modified standard achievement tests to 1,459 Indian pupils. His major finding follows: "... Integrated Indian pupils achieved higher than Indian pupils in Indian schools only on the vocabulary and computation tests. On the comprehension test, there was an unexpected difference favoring Indian pupils in Indian schools over integrated Indian pupils."[48]

Over a period of 4 years, Bass studied comparative achievement by Indian students in State public and Federal high schools, (operated by Bureau of Indian Affairs). Between 1966 and 1970, a sample which fluctuated in size in the vicinity of 1,500 to 3,500, took achievement, intelligence, and psychological tests. Schools were grouped as: (1) on-reservation, Federal; (2) off-reservation, Federal; (3) on-reservation, public; and (4) off-reservation, public.

No significant differences in achievement were found among the types of schools. However, scores did differ importantly by location. For whatever reason, students in Juneau, Alaska, schools scored far higher than students elswhere; in the schools of Aberdeen, S.D., levels were not as high but did show a distinct superiority. On the other hand, no consistent level was characteristic in the Navajo schools and in schools located in Muskogee, Okla., and Phoenix, Ariz. There was a general relative retardation in achievement during the course of the 4 years. At entry into the 9th grade, Indian students lagged behind norm by a year; by the 12th grade, the lag was 2½ years. Socioeconomic status did not emerge as a major factor in academic achievement. Degree of acculturation was found to be positively related to achievement. Yet, Bass writes, "it is not a highly potent factor."[49] Similarly, a direct relationship was found between achievement and language of the home.

Spilka studied a total of 1,508 Indian (Oglala Sioux) and white students; the former attended nine reservation schools; the latter, four town schools. The grade range covered junior high and senior high school. Indian students scored at the national norm or above in nonverbal IQ but lower for verbal IQ. Spilka had hypothesized that "home socioeconomic status will be positively associated with school achievement and child intelligence." He found, however, only "very tentative support" for this generalization.[50] He had also expected to discover that "parental Indianness" would be negatively related to academic achievement and intelligence, but he found no support for this hypothesis. Socioeconomic status played a minor role in that mothers of dropouts tended to be of lower status than mothers of persisters.

Indications of exceedingly low achievement by Indian students are available in bits and pieces. One has literally to patch together an overall impression. In 1972, for example, the Bureau of Indian Affairs reported Indian graduates from BIA high schools scored 3.3 years below the national norm. In other words, after 4 years of high school, the students knew even less than a high school freshman was presumed to have learned by the end of his or her first year of high school. Yet, the Federal General Accounting Office, in a report to Congress, commented that "we could not readily ascertain the reliability of this estimate..." thereby implying that the achievement level might be even lower.[51] In Oklahoma, according to Trimble, "... 44.7 percent of the Indian students in Oklahoma dropped out in 1968."[52] In three counties of northeastern Oklahoma (Adair, Cherokee, and Delaware). Underwood reports Indian dropout rates averaged about 75 percent over the decade ending in 1964-65. During 1965, Underwood interviewed 100 Cherokee households in Cherokee County and found that more than half of all Cherokees under 25 years of age were functional illiterates.[53] In Detroit, a sample of sixth-grade Indian children in the public schools were 1 year behind in reading and were gaining 5 months in achievement for every 10 months of attendance.[54]

SENSE OF SELF AND ASPIRATIONS

Scott studied the Tlingit Indians in Wrangell, Alaska.[55] He found them highly assimilated into the white population. Few Indian children speak or even understand Tlingit; parents urge their young to learn the ways of the whites and unlearn Indian ways. English is all but the universal language. The public school is attended by everyone except a small minority. "Children are not particularly concerned with racial distinctions," reports Scott, "and . . . common education in the public schools has tended to mitigate cultural differences."[56] Between 1913 and 1950, every fourth marriage in Wrangell was interracial.[57] So far has the process of assimilation gone that one Tlingit defined a "native" as "a person who is ashamed of his ancestors."[58] An economic transaction seems to underlay the entire social arrangement; the Indians have been permitted to continue their age-old fishing industry while the whites control everything else as well as a consideerable part of the manufacturing end of the fishing industry. The economic history of Tlingit-white relations includes no example of foreign destruction of Indian territory.

Brant and Hobart contrasted Danish and Canadian policies toward Eskimo education.[59] The Danish policy in Greenland is characterized as "cultural receptivity" and is marked by flexibility and tentativeness. The Canadian policy is characterized as "ethnocentrism" and is marked by "rigidity and crash-program mentality of certainty."[60] Brandt and Hobart wrote:

> Among Greenlandic Eskimos there appears to be a high degree of maintenance of feelings of group self-esteem a positive valuation of most aspects of traditional culture. Danes and things Danish are not accepted wholesale, mechanically, slavishly; ways of doing, attitudes, and motivational patterns are not, in a blanket manner, regarded as good by Eskimos because of their association with the Danish way of life.[61]

The relations between Dane and Eskimo reflect cultural difference rather than cultural hierarchy.

In Canada, however:

> The exclusive use of English as the language of instruction among children understanding this language little or not at all, by teachers knowing nothing of the Eskimo language, creates multiple difficulties. The first year to 2 years of classes are given over almost entirely to teaching English. The tendency to use Eskimo among themselves is discouraged if not prohibited.[62]

Many teachers of Eskimos gain satisfaction from the "masklike smiling faces" of Eskimo children and regard them as evidence of a cheerful and happy adjustment. Far from it, according to Brant and Hobart. They explain that Eskimo parents, "in accord with tradition, commonly counsel their children to contain emotions lest they make the white people at school feel unhappy."[63]

Tefft studied the differential impact of white contact upon Northern Arapaho and Shoshone high school students in Wyoming. He found that the Arapaho surpassed both Shoshone and white in self-to-other alienation and in anomie.[64] Students of both Indian backgrounds frequently interacted with white peers about equally, and seemed to enjoy equal access to educational and employment opportunities. Whites showed a strong preference for Shoshone. Tefft explains the historical background:

> Over the last centry the white community has come to consider the Shoshone tribe as the "friend of the white man" because the Shoshone warriors under Chief Washakie's leadership invariably fought Plains tribes alongside the government armies. One of the Plains tribes which was an enemy of both the Shoshone and the whites was the Arapaho who, in contrast to the Shoshone, have always been considered troublemakers by the whites from early reservation days up until the present.[65]

The Shoshone are regarded as the more "progressive" group.

But neither Indian group wants to become "white." Instead, both desire to be evaluated favorably by the whites who, in fact, constitute the Indians' reference group. Lacking status and membership in the white community, the Arapaho develop feelings of anomie. Possessing the former but not the latter, the Shoshone develop a sense of identity realistically based on acceptance by the socially powerful. Fanon would characterize the situation of both Shoshone and Arapaho as "colonized."[66]

Havighurst and Dreyer have addressed some work specifically on Indian self-concept and self-esteem. "Indians have about the same level of self-evaluation as non-Indians. . ." according to Havighurst.[67] Dreyer summarized his study as showing "a student who was basically positive in his attitude about his future and who looked forward to the future as a time of self-improvement and personal fulfillment."[68] He also wrote that "scholastic achievement was not an important factor in the overall thinking of Indian students." (Yet, Bass found that grades worried Indian high school students more than any other personal-social problem.[69]) In a joint study, Drever and Havighurst reported that self-esteem of boarding school students (all Indians) was relatively low. This was somewhat unexpected since the same researchers reported also that in general "our Indian students who attended school in predominantly Indian student population judged themselves against their Indian peers and rated themselves positively by those standards. . ."[70] By these lights, then, boarding students might be expected to exhibit high self-esteem, and yet they did not. Dreyer and Havighurst account for this discrepancy by stressing that "the *context* within which an individual judges himself is critical to attaching meaning to his so-called 'self-esteem' ratings."[71]

Bass found Indian high school students to be optimistic about their future but their self-concept was self-rated as quite low. Students in off-reservation schools were more optimistic; in such public schools, students recorded the highest (of four types of schools) on social presence and value orientation, two measures of the degree to which Indian students felt comfortable with persons of other cultures. At the same time, Bass points out that Indian students showed a significant and successive increase on these two dimensions between grades 10 to 12, regardless ot the type of school. From this fact he draws the conclusion that "the school has a socializing and acculturating effect upon Indian students."[72] A question that may be raised about this view concerns whether the acculturating student is identifying or simply learning successfully to "live with" white culture. The latter interpretation gains some support from Bass' own finding that "as Indian students progress through high school it appears that they place an increasing value on school, teachers, education, their success in school, their present life, their future, and white people, but experience no increased positive feeling toward them"[73] This is reminiscent of Tefft's search among the Shoshone Indians as previously discussed.

Corrigan studied self-concept of 280 Indian students enrolled in Sherman Indian high school in Riverside, Calif. He found no difference in self-concept when he separated scores of his sample by whether they had attended a public or a Federal boarding elementary school.[74] Withycombe, in a study of self-concept of 108 Paiute Indian and white children in the area around Reno, Nev., found that self-concept of Indian children was lowest in the all-Indian reservation school. Based on an analysis of scores of first graders and fifth graders, Withycombe concluded that "segregation was cumulatively negative in its effect upon self-concept with time in school."[75] Unfortunately, the researcher did not control age or socioeconomic status and so it is not possible to disentangle these elements from the factor of segregation. (Whether an entanglement exists at all is another question.)

The cultural content of Indian children's sense of self-identity is frequently handled in a confusing way by the schools. Bunger reports on her visit to schools in remote regions of Alaska:

> . . . First graders in these two schools in the Alaskan "bush" were concentrating on learning about Thanksgiving . . . Although most of them had only in September begun to learn English, they were now extending their efforts towards a rather useless vocabulary.[76]

At the other extreme are cases, as in the Chicago public schools, where "many teachers did not even know they had Indian students."[77]

In large cities such as Detroit and Chicago, Indian children regularly report they know hardly anything of their native language and just as little of their tribal history. A very different situation exists in southeastern Montana on the adjacent Crow and Northern Cheyenne reservations. In a study of 1,872 school-age children, Dracon found the following:[78]

	Native language is primary language percent	Native language is secondary language percent	English Only used percent
Northern Cheyenne reservation	55	18	27
Crow reservations	82	8	10

On the Crow reservation, 82 percent of first graders spoke Crow as their primary language; fully 79 percent of the 12th graders also spoke it as a primary language. Dracon found no evidence of a long-term decline in the use of the native language on either reservation. Caspar, studying the education of Menominee children in Wisconsin, found much evidence of school disrespect of "Indianness" extending even to the practice by some teachers of forcibly tearing Indian headbands from the heads of Menominee girls in classrooms.[79] Aberle reports that Navajo children are sometimes penalized for using their native language in school.[80] A striving for Indian identity sometimes outweighs Indian interest in the quality of education. According to Visscher, who studied the Northern Cheyenne, "parents and young people agree that adolescents want to go away to schools where they can identify with an Indian peer group, even though the quality of education offered at these schools is not considered better by either parents or students."[81]

Pecoraro investigated the effect on Indian self-concept of using special audiovisual materials relating to cultural and historical aspects of Indian life in Maine. Both Indian and non-Indian children viewed the materials and both reportedly improved their acceptance of Indians. Indian children gained more than non-Indians, thus indicating to Pecoraro an improvement in self-image. The tone and approach of materials can be judged from the researcher's own characterization of a unit on the history of the Passamaquoddy Indians:

> This is a general overview of the tribe which emphasizes the loyalty of these Indians to the United States of America. Explained are those brave Indians who have fought for the country in every war since the Revolutionary War.[82]

One hopes that such material was not typical of the entire exercise for such benevolence would leave the Indian (and non-Indian) child puzzled as to the historic realities of oppression and discrimination.

The reader will recall Bryde's contention, described on page 30, that at about seventh or eighth grade the Oglala Sioux student suddenly suffered a drop in academic achievement; this he called the "crossover phenomenon." He attributed it to the rapid maturing of a sense of Sioux-white value conflicts; the Sioux youngster became rapidly aware of the proportions of the conflict and was overwhelmed by the prospects. This realization gave rise to personality problems and, in time, academic problems.

Purdy, Havighurst, and Dreyer have addressed themselves to this sort of problem. In Purdy's study of Oklahoma Indian second, fourth, and sixth graders, he found the younger students to be quite like white peers in intellectual performance. The sixth graders, however, were quite different since, according to Purdy, by that time they have begun to experience the burdens of "accumulative years in a deprived and semi-isolated environment."[83] This view would tend to support Bryde's interpretation. In mid-1970, Havighurst explicitly rejected Bryde's views, holding that "there appears to be no data from other Indian tribes or from other studies of Indian school achievement to support the existence of the 'crossover phenomenon'."[84] Later in the same year, however, in association with Dreyer, Havighurst reported that "youth of another Sioux reservation were part of our group of Plains Indians and did show a significant drop in 'self-esteem' between the ages 8-11 and 12-14 and a further slight drop in the 15-17 year old group which woulds seem to give limited support to Bryde's findings."[85] It is not known whether the authors were referring to the Oglala Sioux reservation at Pine Ridge. If so, the corroborative value of their finding is heightened.

STUDENT INTERACTION

Greenberg, who had taught for 2 years in a Navajo school, studied integration problems among the Navajo.[86] He observed the barest minimum of special measures to prepare for receiving Navajo children in the public schools. "In many instances," reported Greenberg, "the school boards and superintendents were of the opinion that mere acceptance of Navajo children into their school system implied equality of education."[87] Greenberg warned against a well-meaning disposition to lower standards for Navajo children. He observed: "If the Navajo pupil succeeds within the accepted standards, he is more likely to be able to make his way both inside and outside of the Indian world."[88]

Miller studied Indian ninth graders in 12 integrated schools in North Dakota. He first sketched the stark economic context of schooling for Indians: "A North Dakota Indian . . . who desires to live on the reservation today will be faced with the hard fact that 50 to 90 percent of the Indians residing there are unemployed. . . The problem . . . is one of how best to prepare many Indians for life as a minority group in the dominant white society."[89] Indian students at integrated schools achieved on a higher level and scored lower on an alienation scale than did Indians attending segregated schools; they also accepted more of the values of white society.

Nevertheless, white students preferred to have little to do with any Indian. Miller divided students making sociometric choices into two groups, white students who had had Indian classmates for 8 years (residents) and those who had transferred into the integrated school and thus had Indian classmates for less than 8 years. He found:

> Not only did non-Indians select integrated Indians at a rate lower than would be mathematically expected, but . . . resident non-Indians selected those Indian pupils only to the same extent (7 percent) as did transfer non-Indians. Surprisingly, the attendance of the same school for 8 years did not increase the acceptance of the Indians by their non-Indian classmates.[90]

Of the non-Indians, 57 failed to choose even a single Indian classmate.

Miller concluded that "integration is truly in name only, and that within each classroom a segregated situation generally exists."[91] The track system was found in some schools to create classes almost homogeneous racially. "Unless some improvement is made in the preparation for, and in the transition of, Indian pupils to integrated schools," declared Miller, ". . . such transfer could well be potentially more harmful than helpful to these pupils."[92]

In Calgary, Canada, 32 Sarcee Indian children in one school were studied by Hubert. Ethnic cleavage was almost complete:

> The Indian children will not mix with the white children on their own accord. They seldom choose white partners for their first preference . . . Very seldom has an Indian child ever visited the home of . . . non-Indian classmates.[93]

Indian children rarely volunteered for parts in plays. The arrived in a bus that travelled between their reservation and the school; they ate and played together. The white children, according to Hubert, "treat[ed]the Sarcee children coolly and on an impersonal basis, simply tolerating their presence and not more."[94] While teachers did not encourage the Indian children to tell the class about life on the reservation, Hubert discovered that non-Indian children did pick up a fair amount of information from the Indian children.

TEACHERS IN THE CLASSROOM

Often, the teacher is the most fearful and isolated person in the Indian classroom. Spilka writes of the "feelings of helplessness and futility" on the part of teachers on the Oglala Sioux reservation in Pine Ridge.[95] In Minneapolis junior high school, of 27 teachers who taught Indian students, 11 "felt they were not successful at any time. . ."[90] Teachers at Red Wing High School, Minn., struck Harkins and associates as simply ineffective: ". . . Their inability to communicate with and motivate the Prairie Island Indian youth affected their self-image as effective teachers."[97] Few if any workable measures were taken by administrative authorities to remedy these feelings of inadequacy. In 1972, when a congressional committee queried the Bureau of Indian Affairs about teacher orientation programs, BIA replied:

> All of the areas which operate Federal schools provide orientation programs to acquaint "the teacher with the history and traditions of the people she serves." These brief programs vary in quality and at best are inadequate.[98]

The research literature suggests that the public schools have not been creating any more successful programs.

Teacher discrimination and unconcern are thoroughly documented. In Minneapolis, at a "problem" junior high school, researchers reported: "We found no evidence of gross derogation; we did find an appalling absence of human and professional concern for Indian students on the part of a significant number of ... classroom teachers."[99] In a number of southwestern schools, Smith found that while teachers:

> ... Cited reluctance to speak in class as a major problem, they felt that this was one of the most desirable features about teaching Indian children. Quiet, unresponsive children provided few behavior problems... In general, they felt pessimistic that anything could be done with these children. Undoubtedly this attitude is communicated to the children.[100]

Gunn, himself part Indian, interviewed teachers of Indian students in public schools of Sacramento, Calif. He reported:

> Most of the teachers ... expressed sympathy ... and some expressed a desire to help Indians if they had the opportunity. None, however, suggested that they could "help" educationally by learning more about problems of Indian children.[101]

When Crockett asked Roger Jourdain, chairman of the Red Lake, Minnesota, Tribal Council, what high school teachers could do for Chippewa students, Jourdain replied: "Accept them, yes, just accept them!"[102]

Among the Menominee in Wisconsin, Caspar found, "the majority of the complaints against the teachers made by Indian students illustrate a lack of respect for the Indian child and an imprudent and excessive use of physical force by teachers."[103] In schools of northeastern Oklahoma, according to Wax, the classrooms "could typically be characterized as a small aggregate of English-speaking pupils in continual discourse with the teachers, while about them was a silent group of Cherokee."[104] Many of the teachers in public schools enrolling Cherokee are local whites. "But," comments Wax, "they do not realize their own ignorance, and, in coming from a parochial and constructed rural background, they have no understanding of what it is to be linguistically and culturally alien to the school and its teachers."[105]

A puzzling disjunction exists in the research in this area. On the one hand, empirical studies yield an almost unrelieved picture of teacher insensitivity. On the other hand, regional and national surveys not infrequently report a positive orientation of Indian children toward the school and even the faculty. Perhaps it is easier to forget negative realities when responding to global questions regarding attitudes in general.

INDIAN COMMUNITY AND THE SCHOOLS

In 1964, John Woodenlegs, a leader of the Northern Cheyenne people, told a researcher: "We want our children to learn to walk between the two worlds and take the best from each."[106] This educational philosophy may well be almost universal among Indian communities today. The growing discontent with schools serving Indian children expresses a judgment that they are not learning how to traverse such a path with assurance. Indeed, the suspicion grows that it is the worst rather than the best of both worlds that is the lot of Indian children.

On the reservations, where about half of all Indians still live, poverty is the keynote. In 1972, during a period of national economic prosperity, the U.S. Department of Commerce reported the national unemployment rate at 3.5 percent while it estimated unemployment on the reservations at nearly 50 percent; at the same time, the U.S. Department of Labor placed reservation unemployment at 38 percent.[107] In either case, the ratio of reservation to nonreservation unemployment was between 10-1 and 13-1. From a third to a half of the reservation labor force was unemployed.

In the large cities, Indian communities are no less impoverished. Around 1970 in Detroit, unemployment among Indian heads of households stood at 46 percent.[108] In Chicago, reported Scott and associates, "by far the largest number of the city's Indian population falls into an unstable lower working class group, which is marginal to the economy and the social structure of the big city."[109] This group made up 70 percent of the city's Indians. In Los Angeles, on the other hand, Havighurst wrote that "the 'Indian community' as pictured here is the 60 percent who are most stable in residence, occupation, and Indianness'."[110] However defined, Indian communities are the country's poorest. The severely constricted vocational opportunities facing Indian youths are directly related to this sweeping poverty. Within the same context, the failures of Indian schooling are felt with special force.

Inside many Indian communities, the school's staff keeps its distance from parents as well as students outside the classroom. Repeatedly, researchers report that teachers never or rarely visit homes of students, even when the communities are very small.[111] Gunn writes that of his sample most teachers of Indian children "had never visited an Indian's home but they were positive the home background was undesirable." To be sure, an occasional apparent exception can be found. Thus, Randquist reports that upon visiting the homes of 30 Indian families in Anadarko, Okla., "not one home reported any conflict between school teachings and home folkways and teachings."[112] The fact that Randquist had been an assistant superintendent in the city's schools for 8 years must have alerted Indian parents – especially those with school children – into an excess of prudence.

Knight studied the diaries of 20 teachers who recorded events over a fixed 15-day period (They taught Indian students in southwestern schools.). Events dealing with out-of-school setting numbered 439. Of this total, 126 or 29 percent dealt with Indian people; 74 related to school-connected events; 52 were not school connected. Teachers from two school districts – No. 116 and No. 119 – reported most contact in the Indian community. Knight's field staff reported from its firsthand observations that teaching at 116 was very good; it was poor at 119. A most significant difference, according to Knight, was that teachers at 116 "tended to abstract and discuss the contacts in conscious terms of gaining insight; whereas at . . . 119 only one teacher evidenced this, and not the staff in general."[113] School-community relations were thus best based on a productive classroom educational experience and a planned, deliberate program of reflection and study by the teachers involved. It might be supposed that meeting parents and children outside the classroom was critical to the process of reflection and study.

How fully do Indian parents participate in school affairs? One important piece of research on this question was completed in 1971 by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense Fund (LDF) and the Harvard Center for Law and Education. One of the strongest features of this study was the interviewing of 445 Indian parents.

The researchers found instances of consultation of parents by school districts but the cases were of little substance. In Nebraska and South Dakota, for example, the BIA had concluded contracts with State tribal organizations but LDF declares that "this is Indian control in form but not fact."[114] The researchers arrived at several general conclusions:

> Indian parents are keenly interested in education, but they are alienated from the public schools.
>
> Most Indian parents think their children are not learning. However, for a minority of parents, attendance at public schools is such a great improvement over the distant boarding school or no school at all, that they tend to accept conditions as they are.
>
> Many parents were afraid to talk frankly with our interviewers. They feared exposure, harassment of their children, and possible loss of their jobs . . .
>
> Indian parents know what is wrong in the schools and have valuable suggestions for improvement.[115]

Numerous examples were cited.

Indian membership on school boards, even in predominantly Indian schools, is almost unknown. "All too often," wrote LDF, the board "represents non-Indian interests in the community banking, industry, trading posts, property, law-enforcement – which seek to keep local tax rates as low as possible."[116] In Anadarko, Okla., where Indians constitute about one-third of the population, Randquist reported:

> No members of minority groups had served on the board of education with one exception. One man with some Indian blood once served on the board in the 1950's.[117]

Menominee students made up a similar percentage of students in a Wisconsin school district but their parents were kept off the board by the fact that elections were on an at-large basis.[118] According to Aberle, among the Navajo "there are nominal school boards attached to most reservation schools, but there has been relatively little devolution of authority to date."[119]

Since the late 1960's, Indian communities have begun to generate considerable organized protests around school issues. Apparently, no study has attempted to analyze these events. Here and there, however, evidence is available. In Minneapolis, for example, parent protests have occurred in cooperation with the American Indian Movement (AIM), a nonestablishment group which employs direct action techniques. In far-off Red Wing and Hastings, Minn., Indian parents began meeting with school authorities on a group basis.[120] In Detroit, 1972 saw several small Indian groups starting to work along these lines.[121] An energetic parents' movement among the Menominee was under way during 1969-1972.[122] News of similar developments are reported regularly in *Akwesasne Notes* and *Indian Historian.*[123]

Community control of schools is an issue with deep historic roots among some Indian groups. As previously indicated several times, outright control of schools among five Indian nations – Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole – expressed their legal sovereignty as recognized by treaty. Since 1906, however, this special status has not existed as a consequence of congressional action. Apparently no contemporary movement for control among these five peoples any longer exists.

Weinman has contrasted community control attitudes among two Tewa pueblos in New Mexico. These are Santa Clara and San Juan. It is not so much actual efforts to gain control as attitudinal orientations to the exercising of community control that interests Weinman. She finds Santa Clara to be more ready for local control. Primarily, she holds, this results from a long history of relative openness to change and a practice of challenging authority. The people of San Juan are far more traditional and thus reluctant to envision a takeover of authority. In addition, certain long-term economic reverses have further disposed them to a belief in their own inefficacy. The principal of Espanola High School, attended by youngsters of both pueblos, noted that students from Santa Clara were both "more Indian" and more worldly; or better, too wordly. They were widely admired among all students for achieving this combination. As Weinman relates it:

> He said that Indian high school students have always respected the individual who could integrate well with other students ... Whereas before integration meant being able to get along with others by becoming more like them now it meant getting along with others on one's own terms.[124]

This ability, however, is not necessarily conducive to community control. It could just as well thrive under other circumstances.

One outright experiment in community control has occurred among the Navajos. The Rough Rock Demonstration School was financed by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity. It was evaluated by Erickson and Schwartz during the period September 1968 – April 1969. They concluded:

> ... There is likelihood that the board's overall impact was very positive, reducing the alienation that has often been observed in schools for American Indians.
>
> ... Relationships between the school and its community were unusually, perhaps even phenomenally, rich and well developed.[125]

The evaluators, however, also found many shortcomings. Central among these was an imputed inability by members of the Navajo board to reach an informed, independent decision on proposals made by professionals in their employ. Erickson and Schwartz made much also of the clear tendency of board members to hire disproportionate numbers of their relatives. "There are strong suggestions in the board minutes," they wrote, "that the administrator was 'being good' to the [board] members."[126] Teacher morale was low while teacher turnover was high.[127] The practical dominance of the school by professional educators, which Erickson and Schwartz often imply, strains the community character of a locally controlled school. Wax sees community control as providing "a powerful goad to educators to discard their institutional arrogance and to cease working with conceptual schemes in which the children are simply regarded as 'culturally deprived' or otherwise lacking in the competencies and potentials of properly reared children."[128]

A series of interrelated local actions on behalf of community-controlled schools simply does not exist among Indian communities. Community control, if it ever does arrive, is likely to come as part of a much broader movement for Indian self-determination.

The historian Degler has written that "Indians, when confronted with the choice, have chosen to be red men... Never before... have white Americans encountered people who *refused* the opportunity to become Americans."[129] Perhaps this is true when Indians are pressed to assimilate or remain Indians. These extremes left no choice. But contemporary Indians differ from their 19th century forbears in that the option no longer exists to remain historically "Indian." More than ever they wish to live in two worlds at one time. Ortiz, of the San Jaun Pueblo, wrote about Indian education:

> Little children should be builders of bridges between the two cultures; particularly so when only they can span the gulf between the two, between home and school, the old and the new. They should not be made into unwitting conduits for a forced assimilation policy the weakness of which is all too obvious to those outside of the BIA . . .[130]

Nor is there a feeling that the children should be made to reenact the ancient ways in unchanged form.

Instead of seeking to remain or become an abstract "red man," Indian spokesmen stress the need to establish a new cultural identity. In the words of August Little Soldier, chairman of the Three Affiliated Tribes at Fort Berthold reservation:

> [The cultural approach] does *not* mean that one teaches the Indian how to become a white man, then teach him a trade. The cultural approach means that he is taught how to use his values (he becomes even more Indian) in taking advantage of vocational or liberal educational opportunities and becoming self-supporting . . . He is even more Indian than ever because he has learned how to *use* his values in a new setting.[131]

This view is highly consistent with traditional Indian philosphical orientation which regards the present world, including education, as an instrument rather than as a goal for man.

The recent emergence of higher and professional education among Indians evidences the new direction. In 1970, the following numbers of Indian students were enrolled at various levels of advanced education:[132]

Undergraduate	26,914
Graduate	1,290
Medicine	43
Dentistry	17
Law	192
Total	28,456

In 1974, the newly formed Association of American Indian Physicians (AAIP) compiled the numbers of Indian students attending various professional schools as follows:[133]

Medical school	82
Dental school	13
Veterinarian school	7
Pharmacy school	22
Podiatry school	1
Total	125

There were 25 Indian physicians active in AAIP.

Indian self-determination challenges the reservation regimen which has been called by Cherokee social scientist Thomas "the most complete colonial system in the world that I know about."[134] Economic resources on reservations from which benefits presently flow outward in classic colonial fashion require high skills for their management. But the ending of the colonial framework of reservations requires the gathering of political power. The near future of Indian Americans will thus be deeply influenced by their degree of success in the political sphere. In this larger "community control," education far beyond the confines of the contemporary range will be needed. Resource development will require technical specialists such as economists, engineers, geologists, and planners.[135] It is thus interesting to note that during the early 1970's Peter MacDonald, an engineer, was elected and reelected as head of the Navajo nation.

Educational researchers have paid little attention to the school problems of Indian children. In the future, this situation will undoubtedly change, if only because more Indian educators are beginning to communicate their own ideas. But the research problems would most profitably be set within a framework of a search for self-determination. Viewed this way, it may be no longer necessary to continue piling up psychological studies of individual traits and attitudes. Perhaps more germane would be the designation of practical school curricula and forms of governance that will aid in the achievement of self-determination.

CONCLUSION

Traditional Indian education served communal needs adequately. The European conquests destroyed such education as part of a program to suppress Indian culture and decimate native societies. Under American law, Indians occupy a special status in that their rights were for decades defined by treaties, unlike any other minority. Despite formal protection, however, legal protection was most often denied them in critical areas of life, including education. While financing for Indian schools derived from land given up under varying degrees of compulsion, Indians were denied a voice in the content or operation of their schools. Access to the courts was of minor consequence.

The basic mental ability of Indian children to learn has been documented frequently. In academic achievement, however, they trail far behind white children. Although some researchers attribute most of the lag to the poverty of the children, the research findings do not support this assumption. Among forces influencing low Indian achievement are the discriminatory conditions under which Indians live in the U.S. This factor is only rarely taken into account by researchers. The self-concept of Indian children seems to hold up well in comparison with that of whites although they also learn to keep their distance from white society as a whole as they progress through school. Evidence suggests widespread cultural insensitivity on the part of the school. Indian and white students interact little in a productive, cooperative way when attending the same school. Much hostility is expressed against the Indian children.

Very many teachers are puzzled or made uncomfortable by the presence of Indian children. School authorities, in Federal and local public schools, seem equally uninterested in helping such teachers. Instances of outright teacher discrimination and unconcern are documented extensively. School staff has little to do with local Indian communities. While Indian parents are eager to have their children succeed in the two worlds of Indian and white, they are often rebuffed and alienated from the school. This is as true in the large city as on the reservation. While parents appear sometimes as passive observers, researchers report repeatedly after interviewing them that the opposite seems to obtain.

Although a few experiments in community-controlled schools have been conducted, almost none has been evaluated. In any event, the future of Indian education is dependent upon the achievement of self-determination by Indian Americans.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See George A. Pettit, *Primitive Education in North America* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1946).

[2] William H. Kelley, *A Study of Southern Arizona School-Age Indian Children 1966-1967* (Tucson, Ariz.: Bureau of Ethnic Research, University of Arizona, 1967), p. 61.

[3] Margaret Szasz, *Education and the American Indian. The Road to Self-Determination, 1928-1973* (Albuquerque, N.Mex.: University of New Mexico Press, 1974), p. 188.

[4] *Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law* (Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico Press, 1971 orig. 1942), p. 5.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[7] Quoted in Bryce Nelson, "Indians Lose Case for Sovereignty," *Los Angeles Times*, January 18, 1975.

[8] *Quick Bear v. Leupp*, 210 U.S. 50 (1908).

[9] *In re Petition of Can-ah-couqua for Habeas Corpus*, 29 Fed. 689-690 (1887).

[10] Gertrude Golden, *Red Moon Called Me. Memoirs of a Schoolteacher in the Government Indian Service*, ed. by Cecil Dryden (San Antonio, Tex.: Naylor, 1954), p. 83.

[11] See *Sioux Tribe of Indians v. United States*, 84 C.Cls. 28 (1936) and *Duwamish et. al. Indians v. United States*, 79 C.Cls. 530 (1934).

[12] *Piper v. Big Pine School District*, 193 Col. 667 (1924).

[13] Szasz, *Education and the American Indian*, p. 6.

[14] See Robert Severt Johnson, *Comparative Study of Educational Attainment of Warm Springs Indians ana Non-Indians in the Madras Union High School for the Years 1956-1965 Inclusive* (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1967), p. 54; Donald Milton Lammers, *Self-Concepts of American Adolescents Having Segregated and Desegregated Elementary Backgrounds* (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969), p. 52; and Bernard Spilka, *Alienation and Achievement Among Oglala Sioux Secondary School Students*, August 1970, p. 172 (ERIC ED 045 225).

[15] Judith S. Kleinfeld, *Cognitive Strengths of Eskimos and Implications for Education*, November 1970, p. 1 (ERIC ED 045 281).

[16] Judith S. Kleinfeld, "Intellectual Strengths in Culturally Different Groups: An Eskimo Illustration," *Review of Educational Research*, 43 (Summer 1973), p. 351.

[17] Carol Fleischer Feldman, Benjamin Lee, James Dickson McLean, David B. Pillemer, and James R. Murray, *The Development of Adaptive Intelligence* (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1974), p. ix.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[19] Joyce Jensen, *School Readiness and Achievement of Crow Indian Children, First through Fourth Grades, at Pryor, Montana* (Master's Thesis, Montana State University, 1969), p. 8.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[22] Robert J. Havighurst, *Mental Development and School Achievement of American Indian Children and Youth*, June 1970, p. 4 (ERIC ED 040 798).

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[24] Joseph Donald Purdy, *Associative Learning Rates of Second-Fourth-, and Sixth-Grade Indian and White Children Using a Paired-Associate Learning Task* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968), pp. 44-45.

[25] *Kenneth E. Anderson, E. Gordon Collister, and Carl E. Ladd, The Educational Achievement of Indian Children* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1953).

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[28] L. Madison Coombs, Ralph E. Kron, E. Gordon Collister, and Kenneth E. Anderson, *The Indian Child Goes to School. A Study of Interracial Differences* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1958).

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[30] *Ibid.* p. 133.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[35] Joyce Griffen, *Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students From Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965) (University Microfilms No. 65-13, 334).

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[37] John F. Bryde, S. J., *The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict* (Pine Ridge, S. Dak. 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966). See also, Bryde, "A New Approach to Indian Education," *Integrated Education*, September-October 1968.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[43] *Ibid.*, pp. 83 and 88.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 104.

[45] President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, *The People Left Behind* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September 1967), p. 51. See, also, Virgil J. Vogel, *The Indian in American History* (Chicago, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1968).

[46] See, also, William A. Brophy and Sophie D. Aberle (compilers), "Education," chapter 5 in *The Indian. America's Unfinished Business* (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966).

[47] H. J. Dilling, "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," *Ontario Journal of Educational Research*, Autumn 1965.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 51.

[49] Willard P. Bass, *An Analysis of the Academic Achievement of Indian High School Students in Federal and Public Schools*, May, 1971, p. 90 (ERIC ED 064 000).

An earlier progress report, dated May 1969, is available as ERIC ED 036 392 (Hereinafter cited as Bass).

[50] Spilka, *Alienation and Achievement*, p. 369.

[51] Comptroller General of the United States, *Opportunity to Improve Indian Education in Schools Operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs* (Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, April 27, 1972), p. 7.

[52] Joseph E. Trimble, *An Index of the Social Indicators of the American Indian in Oklahoma*, January 19, 1972, p. 91 (ERIC ED 064 002).

[53] Jerald Ross Underwood, *An Investigation of Educational Opportunity for the Indian in Northeastern Oklahoma* (Doctroal dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966), p. 83.

[54] Thomas E. Glass, *A Descriptive and Comparative Study of American Indian Children in the Detroit Public Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972), pp. 195, 238.

[55] John C. Scott, Jr., *Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1953).

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 263.

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 633.

[58] *Ibid.*, footnote, p. 15.

[59] C. S. Brant and C. W. Hobart, "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 18-21, 1965.

[60] A somewhat more favorable interpretation can be found in J. Roby Kidd, "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," *Integrated Education*, December 1966-January 1967.

[61] Brant and Hobart, pp. 5-6.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[64] Stanton K. Tefft, "Anomy, Values and Culture Change Among Teen-Age Indians: An Exploratory Study," *Sociology of Education*, 40 (1967) 150.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

[66] See Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks.*

[67] Robert J. Havighurst, *The Indian Self-Image as Evaluated with the Semantic Differential*, August 1970, p. 6 (ERIC ED 044 217).

[68] Philip H. Dreyer, *The Relation of Self-Esteem to Personal-Social Adjustment Among American Indian Students: The Personal-Social Adjustment of American Indian Youth*, September 1970, p. 5 (ERIC ED 045 276).

[69] Bass, *An Analysis*, p. 56

[70] Philip H. Dreyer and Robert J. Havighurst, *The Self-Esteem of American Indian Youth. The Personal-Social Adjustment of American Indian Youth*, November 1970, p. 9 (ERIC ED 045 273).

[71] *Ibid.* (emphasis added).

[72] Bass, *An Analysis*, p. 98.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

[74] Francis Vincent Corrigan, *A Comparison of Self Concepts of American Indian Students from Public or Federal School Backgrounds* (Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1970), p. 131.

[75] Jeraldine Smith Withycombe, *An Analysis of Self-Concept and Social Status of Paiute Indian and White Elementary School Children in Nevada* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1970), p. 77.

[76] Marianna Bunger, *Teaching Alaska Native Youth*, 1970, p. 5 (ERIC ED 045 588).

[77] George D. Scott and others, *Indians and Their Education in Chicago*, November 1969, p. 49 (ERIC ED 039 079).

[78] John Dracon, *The Extent of Bilingualism Among the Crow and the Northern Cheyenne Indian School Populations, Grades One Through Twelve*, March 1970, pp. 5-6 (ERIC ED 044 205).

[79] Margery G. Caspar, "The Education of Menominee Youth in Wisconsin," *Integrated Education*, 11 (January-February 1973), p. 47.

[80] David F. Aberle in U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Joint Economic Committee, Subcommittee on Economy in Government, *Toward Economic Development for Native American Communities. A Compendium of Papers*. . . I (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 267.

[81] Sietwende Hermberg Visscher, *A Preliminary Study of Some Attitudes Toward Cultural and Educational Conflicts of Indian Children in Montana* (Master's thesis, Montana State University, 1970), p. 35.

[82] Joseph Pecoraro, *The Effect of a Series of Special Lessons on Indian History and Culture Upon the Attitudes of Indian and Non-Indian Students*, August 1970, p. 35 (ERIC ED 043 556).

[83] Purdy, *Associative Learning Rates*, p. 45.

[84] Havighurst, *Mental Development*, p. 7. On pages 6-7 appears a letter from Bryde, replying to Havighurst's criticisms.

[85] Dreyer and Havighurst, *The Self Esteem of American Indian Youth*, footnote, p. 4.

[86] Norman C. Greenberg, *Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963).

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[89] Harold J. Miller, *The Effects of Integration on Rural Indian Pupils* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968), p. 95. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8560).

[90] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

[91] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

[93] Kenneth W. Hubert, *A Study of the Attitudes of Non-Indian Children Toward Indian Children in an Integrated Urban Elementary School* (Master's thesis, University of Calgary, 1969), p. 18.

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[95] Spilka, *Alienation and Achievement*, p. 410.

[96] Arthur M. Harkins, Judith Hammond, I. Karon Sherarts, and Richard G. Woods, *Junior High Indian Children in Minneapolis: A Study of One Public School*, July 1970, pp. 44-45 (ERIC ED 042 214).

[97] Arthur M. Harkins, I. Karon Sherarts, and Richard G.

Woods, *Public Education of the Prairie Island Sioux: An Interim Report*, December 1969, p. 42 (ERIC ED 040 797).

[98] Quoted in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, *Comprehensive Indian Education Act. Hearings. . .* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 191.

[99] Harkins and others, *Junior High Indian Children*, p. 53.

[100] Waldron P. Smith, *The Attitudes and Beliefs of Teachers Concerning the Education of American Indian Children in the Southwest*, March 1970, pp. 6-7 (ERIC ED 051 957).

[101] James A. Gunn, *An Investigation of the Scholastic Success of American Indian Children in the Sacramento City Schools* (Master's thesis, Sacramento State College, 1970), p. 47.

[102] David A. Crockett, *An Inquiry Into the Integration of the Chippewa Indian In the Secondary Schools of Northern Minnesota* (Master's thesis, St. Cloud State College, 1967), p. 46.

[103] Caspar, "The Education of Menominee Youth," p. 47.

[104] Murray L. Wax, *Indian Americans. Unity and Diversity* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hill, 1971), p. 118.

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 122.

[106] Visscher, *A Preliminary Study*, p. 2.

[107] U.S. Congress, *Toward Economic Development*, II, pp. 358, 389.

[108] Glass, *A Descriptive and Comparative Study*, p. 192.

[109] Scott and associates, *Indians and Their Education in Chicago*, p. 6.

[110] Robert J. Havighurst, *Indians and Their Education in Los Angeles*, March 1970, p. 1 (ERIC ED 039 078).

[111] See Harkins and associates, *Public Education of the Prairie Island Sioux*, p. 31; Smith, *Attitudes and Beliefs*, p. 7; Caspar, "The Education of Menominee Youth," p. 46.

[112] Bobby Wayne Randquist, *An Investigation of the Educational Attainment and Opportunities of American Indian Students in the Anadarko Public School System* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970), p. 115.

[113] Margaret E. Knight, *The Nature of Teacher-Community Contact in Schools Serving Southwest Indian Children*, March 1970, p. 4 (ERIC ED 052 880).

[114] NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund with the cooperation of the Center for Law and Education, Harvard University, *An Even Chance* (New York: NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1971), p. 24.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[117] Ranquist, *An Investigation*, p. 93.

[118] Caspar, "The Education of Menominee Youth," p. 50.

[119] U.S. Congress, *Toward Economic Development* I, p. 267.

[120] Harkins and associates, *Public Education of the Prairie Island Sioux*, p. 69.

[121] Glass, *A Descriptive and Comparative Study*, p. 119.

[122] Caspar, "The Education of Menominee Youth," p. 50.

[123] *Akwesasne Notes* is published by Program in American Studies of the State University of New York at Buffalo; Copublisher is D-Q University, Box 409, Davis, Calif.; *Indian Historian* is published by the American Indian Historical Society, 1451 Masonic Ave., San Francisco, Calif. 94117.

[124] Janice Jenny Weinman, *Local Control Over the Schools in Two American Indian Communities: A Preliminary Examination of Structural Constraints and "Internal Control" Attitudes*, 1970, p. 147 (ERIC ED 060 988).

[125] Donald A. Erickson and Henrietta Schwartz, with Oswald Werner, *Community School at Rough Rock*, April 1969, section 3.30 (A Report Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Contract No. B89-45 34).

[126] *Ibid.*, section 3.27.

[127] Donald A. Erickson and Henrietta Schwartz, "What Rough Rock Demonstrates," *Integrated Education*, 8 (March-April 1970), p. 33. On other community-controlled schools see *Inequality in Education*, No. 7 (1971), pp. 8-9.

[128] Murray L. Wax, *Gophers or Gadflies: Problems of Indian School Boards*, March 1970, p. 9 (ERIC ED 041 684).

[129] Carl N. Degler, "Indians and Other Americans," *Commentary*, 54 (November 1972), p. 72.

[130] Alfonso Ortiz, "Native Education Under Fire," *Indian Historian*, 2 (Summer 1969), p. 11.

[131] U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Indian Education, *Indian Education, 1969. Hearings . . .*, Part 4 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 1254, 1256. (Emphasis in original.)

[132] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights, *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall, 1970* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 116, 177, 185, 190, and 200. The category "Graduate" includes enrollments in professional schools other than medical, dental, and law schools.

[133] *Indian Voices. The Native American Today. The Second Convocation of American Indian Scholars* (San Francisco, Calif.: American Indian Educational Publishers, 1974), p. 189.

[134] Robert K. Thomas, "Colonialism: Classic and Internal," *New University Thought*, 4 (Winter 1966-1967), p. 39.

[135] For a view of past and present Navajo economic problems, see Allan Hulsizer, *Region and Culture in*

the Curriculum of the Navaho and the Dakota (Federalsburg, Md.: J. W. Stowell, 1940); David F. Aberle, "A Plan for Navajo Economic Development," pp. 223-276 in U.S. Congress, *Toward Economic Development for Native American Communities,* I; and George A. Boyce, *When Navajos Had Too Many Sheep. The 1940's* San Francisco, Calif.: Indian Historian Press, 1974).

CHAPTER 13
CONCLUSIONS

The American public school system from its outset was based on racial and ethnic exclusivism. For more than a century, this spirit infused the principal institutions and practices of the schools, including higher education. Only during the past generation have protest movements, initiated by excluded minorities, begun to open the public schools to all children. The greater part of the task remains undone.

Planned segregation and deliberate deprivation of minority children were installed in American education with the full cooperation of the law. The highest Federal and State courts fashioned legal doctrines to defend the constitutionality of racial discrimination. Since the mid-20th century, with the growing self-consciousness of black, Mexican American, Indian American, and Puerto Rican communities, the laws have started to unbend in the direction of equal educational opportunity. During the 1950's, 1960's, and 1970's the U.S. Supreme Court constructed a theory of the affirmative constitutional obligation of school systems to dismantle racially discriminatory practices. Quantitatively, the greatest progress in desegregation resulted from this change in orientation.

The theory of racial inferiority in intellectual ability arose as a defense of slavery and other oppressive practices. It was refurbished later to fit newer circumstances. In more recent times, the contention was revived first by some opponents of desegregation. More recently, the argument has been decked out in a scientific-sounding apparatus. Genetic evidence to support the racial inferiority doctrine, however, has never been successfully produced.

While the schools have been opened to all, minority children frequently fail to benefit from attending them. Prevailing educational theory ascribes this failure to the shortcomings of the children or to characteristics of their families. Consequently, a norm of differential achievement for children according to income level of parents has gained widespread acceptance among educational staffs and researchers. This interpretation has attained the status of a self-evident truth among some.

Yet, by careful examination of the empirical conditions under which minority children learn or do not learn in schools, a different viewpoint can be defended. Numerous cases have been recorded which contradict the dominant view. Intellectual differences are bridged whereas social class theory requires separation. By choosing more appropriate testing devices, by altering social circumstances, and simply by affording more human consideration to customarily low achieving children, the traditional socioeconomic barriers to learning appear less formidable.

Desegregation has moved from a theory to a fact. Judging from actual cases of desegregated schooling, one may conclude under desegregation:

1. Academic achievement rises as the minority child learns more while the advantaged majority child continues to learn at his accustomed rate. Thus, the achievement gap narrows. There is no evidence that the presence of middle class children is required in desegregated schools before such an achievement effect begins to operate.

2. Minority children gain a more realistic conception of their vocational and educational future. This process may involve a scaling up or a scaling down of older aspirations. Self-acceptance and self-concepts of minority children are higher than under segregation.

3. Positive racial attitudes by black and white students develop as they attend school together.

Attendance in one desegregated school facilitates attendance in other desegregated schools.

4. The role of teachers and principals is crucial in generating mutual respect and productive learning among students of different races.

5. Black communities throughout the country have sustained their support of desegregation, including the use of busing if necessary.

While children of each ethnic minority have distinctive problems, their greatest common problem is the persistent failure of schools to accept them as they are and to go on from there. In the case of Mexican American, Puerto Rican, and Indian American children, the added factor of language difference is converted into a learning handicap when it could easily become an educational advantage.

In the second edition of this book, published during 1970, 10 trends in research were indicated. They are repeated here together with brief reviews of the extent to which the predicted developments have materialized.

1. "The scope of desegregation research will expand to deal more adequately with the Indian American and Spanish-surnamed Americans."

As is clear from chapters 11 and 12, some studies have been made, especially of Indian children. However the number of such studies remains small.

2. "The units of research analysis will be both smaller and larger: (a) the classroom rather than the school will be studied; and (b) the school system rather than the individual school will be analyzed."

A most welcome emphasis in some of the best recent research is on the classroom as such. Where the research is based on direct observation rather than questionnaires, much dependable knowledge has been obtained. This newer line of research also facilitates a more realistic explanation of school outcomes. It has also become clear that the course of desegregation depends on the teacher and upon school processes such as grouping; these factors are more easily comprehended on a classroom scale.

Few school systems have been studied in their entirety with respect to interracial factors. Such studies were done in Florida, Michigan, and several other places. Elsewhere, parts of school systems – such as elementary or high schools – have been scrutinized since 1970. School authorities' concern about possible legal liability for conditions observed by such studies has limited the degree to which they are permitted.

3. "More universities will engage in desegregation research as desegregation becomes socially acceptable."

In cities which have not desegregated, universities remainfearful of championing an unpopular cause. By and large, they have not changed their view that research into desegregation threatens to upset close relations of dependence upon local school systems. This is especially true of the most prominent centers of graduate study in education. Where desegregation has been defused as a community issue, especially in the South, research on desegregation proceeds more easily. Even in the South, however, universities have turned away from Federal grants to help implement desegregation. At times, when grants are accepted vague names are used to describe university-based installations financed by such grants.

4. "School boards will become more research-permissive, if not research-minded, in response to increasing government requirements to demonstrate results."

This has happened to a considerable degree. Both the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) and the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) made receipt of grants by school districts conditional upon agreement to cooperate in a formal evaluation of the grant project. Under ESAP, the largest scale desegregation study yet made in the United States was completed in 1973. As reported previously several times, the study showed a significant positive achievement effect with one large group of black students. Similar requirements are by now almost standard legislative procedure in many fields of Federal expenditure other than desegregation. As local school funds continue to be pressed, the incentive value of Federal grants will grow.

5. "In part because of a research emphasis on the classroom, desegregation will be more closely linked with pedagogical and instructional improvements."

Numerous indications point to such developments. As desegregation is practiced more widely and recedes from community controversy, it is viewed increasingly as an educational challenge.

There is probably more active educational rethinking and searching for new approaches in desegregated schools than in any other group of American schools. Less and less are practitioners concerned with the intricacies of rhetoric as they become more and more involved with educational improvement. Repeatedly the question is heard from educators: How can we make the transition easier? This search goes far beyond a simplistic technical device or gimmick which may promise overnight success.

6. "Comparative perspectives will be employed increasingly as American desegregation problems are compared with foreign orientations to overcoming segregation and disadvantage."

Unfortunately, experience of other countries has hardly been consulted. It remains an area of real promise.

7. "Desegregation research will become more relevant to school practice as it is utilized by courts and administrative bodies to direct changes in educational procedures."

A beginning has been made in this direction. Researchers have begun to experiment with specific procedures designed to overcome problems such as low expectancies of achievement by minority students. Research in bilingual and bicultural education has received considerable stimulus from court decisions. Courts have directed educators to produce comprehensive instructional and curricular programs. These orders have pointed up the need for further research.

8. "Federal executive agencies will encourage desegregation research by: (a) gathering nationwide benchmark statistics on racial aspects of schooling, and (b) expending more funds for research projects."

The preëminent source of statistics on desegregation is the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These figures are unaudited and they are not widely publicized. Thus far, also, little analytical use has been made of the nationwide data. Other than funds for evaluation of grant projects, little money has been appropriated by Congress for original research on desegregation.

9. "Congress will tend to be more receptive to desegregation research as research outcomes demonstrate the interdepencence of educational improvement and desegregation."

Little evidence of such a trend has appeared.

10. "Sociological and psychological perspectives will grow in importance in educational research to the mutual benefit of all the scholarly fields concerned."

Rather, what has happened is this: The psychology has grown more sociological and the sociology has become more psychological. Students are viewed less as isolated individual strivers and more as actors in a collective drama in which broad social forces such as discrimination play a critical role in school affairs. On the other hand, sociology has become less involved with discovering statistical regularities and more concerned with the complexities of student behavior in classroom contexts.

In general, then, the projected trends have worked themselves out in most respects.

Certain unanticipated research developments have occurred since 1970.

1. Partisan distortions of research results have become more numerous although the motivations involved are not always clear. Since knowledge of research results on desegregation by social scientists and educators is spotty at best, newly announced research findings are frequently treated as though they were the first of their kind. Interpretations then proceed in a lopsided way, without benefit of acquaintance with the main run of research. Outright opposition to the very possibility of desegregation is no longer encountered in the journals. Instead, highly selected research results are cited to support one or the other side. Few of the works on desegregation reported in the present work, for example, have been referred to in controversies over desegregation. Yet, they form a large part of the reseach results. It would seem fruitless to expect the press and legislators to be better informed when the learned world itself lags in knowlege.

2. Organized minority communities are increasingly demonstrating skepticism of, and even outright opposition to, research on their children. Among the most important reasons is the belief that the research does not lead to perceptible improvement in the quality of their children's education. Consequently, researchers are viewed as scholarly entrepreneurs who wish to gain some personal end that is unconnected with the community's self-interest. The further fact that researchers are almost always of a dominant ethnic group helps to distance the researcher from the community.

Unfortunately, however, the growing racial consonance of researcher and community has not necessarily changed this situation. If, for example, black researchers, rather than white researchers, carry out work that does not help the community in some palpable way, the community has not won anything by the racial change. In the future, organized parents may insist on joining the research – no matter who conducts it – to help plan the design, monitor the project, and interpret the findings. A prior intervention would concern the very choice of projects to be undertaken.

3. Historical research on problems of schools has expanded greatly. Aside from stimulating further historical research, this newer work has yet to influence educational thought and practice in a significant way. The coverage of the new trend is uneven; all but a small part of it deals with urban and northern education. Since the major patterns of racial and ethnic discrimination by the schools were established in rural and southern and southwestern circumstances – for blacks, Mexican American, Indian Americans, and Puerto Ricans – the new historical research tends to ignore them. As a result, these minorities become a subordinate consideration.

The new research tends to organize itself from a bureaucratic framework since it has hit upon large-scale city school systems as the main object of inquiry. Much attention is paid to the declarations of formal school board policies with very little attention expended on developments within the school and classroom. In the realm of race and schools, however, the very reverse would be more in order. Racial policies are rarely articulated but they find their locale nevertheless in the schools. By stressing formal policies, one cannot help overlooking extensive developments in the schools.

One may hope that eventually more than history will be treated historically. Every major aspect of the educational institution should be examined in terms of its origin and career.

4. Certain lines of recent research have tended to distract attention from racial realities in the schools. Such has been the case with the issue of interdistrict financial inequalities. These differences have been illustrated endlessly from a wide sampling of States. Implicit is the proposition that ending financial disparities will do away with the discrimination. Historically there is little, if any, warrant that larger of smaller taxing units affect basic inequalities in education. Further, there is the question whether minority students are injured more by interdistrict or intradistrict inequalities. Very few formal inquiries have been made into this matter. As research of a social-psychological character focuses increasingly on individual schools and classrooms, the nature of intradistrict inequalities will become clearer.

5. The still-dominant view of the school as an essentially neutral and passive element in the creation of educational inequalities has begun to lose its cogency. This trend will in all likelihood continue. Few other tendencies bear as much promise for future educational research and change.

The incessantly cited dictum that school achievement varies with social class or family background is also weakening along with the orthodox explanation that a child with certain social advantages is thereby better prepared to profit from school experiences. Therefore, poor children are regarded as disadvantaged. But, according to emerging concepts, it is just as logical to contend that the school (staff, faculty, school board) selects the stance it will adopt toward children of varying social circumstances. In short, poor children will learn if the schools choose to educate them.

Beyond logic alone, however, this alternative explanation is strongly supported by historical experience. During the 19th century when the southern Indian nations controlled their own schools, their children learned, in many cases using two languages. There was no talk about social disadvantage. Descendants of the same children are today among the poorest educated students in the county. School and community attitudes toward them are chiefly accountable for this shortfall. Yet, most discussions center on their poverty. The evidence of law shows, too, a continuing effort to deprive and to segregate. And, finally, the findings of research on bias among school staff, including teachers, further support the view that the school is an active element in the failure of many minority children to achieve academically.

A school that chooses to discriminate is also capable of reversing its choices. On the other hand, a school that is helpless to resist whatever problem assails it is incapable of changing directions.

6. The relationship between education and integration bears far more explication than it has thus far received. A disjunction between the two is often assumed by both partisans of and

antagonists to integration. Nothing in the research evidence supports such a view. Eliminating the bonds of racial discrimination by itself help create the framework of a better education. But this should not become an argument on behalf of planlessness. Specific instructional strategies – and this is what many people regard as "education – must accompany an integration plan. This is the practical purpose of integration.

In the early 1960's many proponents of desegregation declared that overcoming segregation and deprivation required no more than attendance of black and white children in one school. Today, the same contention is seen more properly as a prescription for failure. Indeed, a number of experiences pointed out as demonstrating the unworkability of desegregation illustrate, instead, the inevitability of failure if nothing changes other than the racial composition of the school. The volume of negative evidence on this question is overwhelming; much of it has been cited here.

The present generation has a great deal to learn about the practical workings of equal educational opportunity. Research can help in those efforts. The greater danger is the return of old mental sets that make this impossible. The color line is like a noose lying loosely around the throat of democratic reform. If it is not torn away, it will tighten. In that case, equal opportunity of any kind will evaporate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aberdeen, Frank David. *Adjustment to Desegregation: A Description of Some Differences Among Negro Elementary School Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-4025)

Aberle, David F., "A Plan for Navajo Economic Development," in U.S. Congress, 91st, 2nd session, Joint Economic Committee, Subcommittee on Economy in Government, *Toward Economic Development for Native American Communities. A Compendium of Papers*... Vol. I, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969

Abrahams, Paul, "Black Thursday at Oshkosh," *Crisis*, 76 (1969)

Abramson, Edward E., "Levels of Aspiration of Negro 9th Grade Males in Integrated and Segregated Schools" *Psychological Reports*, 29 (1971)

Abrell, Ronald L. and Charles C. Hanna. "High School Unrest Reconsidered," *High School Journal*, 54 (1970-1971) 396-404

Acuna, Rudolfo. *Occupied America. The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation.* San Francisco, Calif., Canfield Press, 1972

Adair, Alvis V. R. *A Developmental Study of Race and Sex Role Awareness Among Black Preschool Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 73-97)

Adams, Jerry. "Adaptive Behavior and Measured Intelligence in the Classification of Mental Retardation," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 79 (July 1973)

_________ McIntosh, Eranell I., and Weade, Barbara. "Ethnic Background, Measured Intelligence, and Adaptive Behavior Scores in Mentally Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 78 (July 1973)

Ade, J. F., Ajayi and E. J. Alagoa. "Black Africa: The Historians' Perception," *Daedalus*, 103 (Spring 1974)

Agger, Robert E. and Clyde DeBerry. "School and Race in Portland," *Integrated Education*, 3 (April-May 1965) 11-27

Alabama League for the Advancement of Education, *The Slow Death of the Black Educator in Alabama*, July 1, 1971

Alam, Bilquis A., *Perception of Opportunity and Occupational Expectations: A Racial Comparison of Rural Youth*, April 1968 ERIC ED 021 663

Alexander, Herbert B., "A Comparison of the Ranks of American States in Army Alpha and in Social-Economic Status" *School and Society*, 16 (September 30, 1922)

Allen, Donald E. and Oliver W. Robinson. *Some Factors Affecting Academic Performance of Public Assistance Students*, 1969. ERIC ED 029 747

Allen, Irving L. and David Colfax. *Urban Problems and Public Opinion in Four Connecticut Cities.*, Storrs, Connecticut: Institute of Urban Research, University of Connecticut, December 1968

Allen, Jesse Lee. *The Effects of School Desegregation on the Employment Status of Negro Principals in North Carolina.* Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-16, 748)

Alman, Emily. "Desegregation at Rutgers University," in Rhoda L. Goldstein (ed.), *Black Life and Culture in the United States*, New York: Crowell, 1971

Amermann, Helen E. *The Impact of Inter-Group Relations on Non-Segregated Urban Public Education.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954

Amos, Robert T. "The Accuracy of Negro and White Children's Predictions of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Negro Students," *Journal of Negro Education*, 21 (1952)

Anastasiow, Nicholas J. *Language Reconstruction Patterns of Kindergarten, First and Second Graders as Indicators of the Development of Cognitive Processes: A Study Exploring the Difference-Deficit Explanations of Language Behavior.* Bloomington, Ind.: Institute for Child Study, Indiana University, n.d.

Anderson, James G., William H. Johnson and Robert Lange. *Mexican-American Students in a Metropolitan Context: Factors Affecting the Social-Emotional Climate of the Classroom,* July 1969. ERIC ED 030 521.

________ and Dwight Safar. "The Influence of Differential Community Perceptions on the Provision of Equal Educational Opportunities," *Sociology of Education,* 40 (1967)

Anderson, Kenneth E., E. Gordon Collister, and Carl E. Ladd. *The Educational Achievement of Indian Children,* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1953

Anderson, Jr., Robert E. *The South and Her Children: School Desegregation 1970-1971.* Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Council, March 1971

Andrews, Pearl Thompson, *A Study of the Effects of "Black Studies" on the Self-Concept of Negro Kindergarten Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-12, 071)

Angelou, Maya. *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings.* New York: Random House, 1969

Arkansas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Public Education in Arkansas, 1963, Still Separate and Still Unequal.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September 1963

Armor, David J. "The Evidence on Busing," *Public Interest,* No. 28 (Summer 1972)

Armstrong, Marjorie. *Community Participation by Blacks: Its Relationship to School Achievement.* Master's thesis, Northeastern Illinois State University, 1971

Armstrong, Roy Anthony. *Test Bias from the Non-Anglo Viewpoint: A Critical Evaluation of Intelligence Test Items by Members of Three Cultural Minorities.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-25,504)

Asher, Steven R., and Vernon L. Allen. "Racial Preference and Social Comparison Processes." *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

Ausubel, David P. and Pearl. "Ego Development Among Segregated Negro Children" in Harry A. Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963

Backman, Margaret Esther. "Patterns of Mental Abilities: Ethnic, Socioeconomic, and Sex Differences," *American Educational Research Journal,* 9 (Winter 1972)

________ *Relationship of Ethnicity, Socioeconomic Status, and Sex to Patterns of Mental Abilities.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 73-8929)

Bagley, Christopher. "IQ and Europid Link Is a Myth." *Times Educational Supplement,* March 8, 1974, letter

Bailey, Stephen K. *Disruption in Urban Secondary Schools.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971

Ballantine, Jeanne H., Leonard Cargan, and Harden P. Ballantine. *The Threat of Busing: Real or Imagined.* Dayton, Ohio: Wright State University, n.d.

Banks, Ronald and Mary Ellen Di Pasquale. *A Study of the Educational Effectiveness of Integration* (Buffalo: Buffalo Public Schools, January 1969

Banks, W. Curtis, and William James Rompf. "Evaluative Bias and Preference in Black and White Children." *Child Development,* 44 (1973)

Banks, William M. "The Changing Attitudes of Black Students," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 48 (May 1970)

Banton, Michael. "1960: A Turning Point in the Study of Race Relations," *Daedalus,* 103 (Spring 1974)

Barber, Ralph W. *The Effects of Open Enrollment on Anti-Negro and Anti-White Prejudices Among Junior High School Students in Rochester, New York.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-15, 871)

Barnebey, Norma Saxe. *The Study of the Effect of the Race of Examiner on the Test Performance of Negro and White Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-26, 971)

Bartee, Geraldine McMurry. *The Perceptual Characteristics of Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students.* Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1128)

Bass, Edwin Jordan. *An Investigation of Changes in Selected Ninth Grade Students' Concepts of Self and of Others After Interaction with Selected Materials Taught in Integrated and Segregated Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-4685)

Bass, Willard P. *An Analysis of the Academic Achievement of Indian High School Students in Federal and Public Schools,* May, 1971. ERIC ED 064 000

Baxter, Albert Sidney. *Status and Characteristics of Displaced Negro Teachers in Arkansas, 1954-1968.* Ph.D. dissertation University of Arkansas, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-26, 227)

Baxter, Katherine B., Jane R. Cosby, and Frances M. May. "What We've Been Through Is the Introduction," *Integrated Education,* 11 (November-December 1974) 28-31

Bayton, James A., and Tressie W. Muldrow. "Interacting Variables in the Perception of Racial Personality Traits," *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality,* 3 (1968)

Beardsley, Edward H. "The American Scientist as a Social Activist: Franz Boaz, Burt G. Wheeler, and the Fight for Racial Justice, 1900-1915" *Isis,* 64 (March 1973)

Beckham, Albert Sidney. "A Study of Race Attitudes in Negro Children of Adolescent Age," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 29 (1934-1935)

Beecher, Robert Houston. *A Study of Social Distance Among Adolescents of Ethnic Minorities.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11,780)

Beers, Joan S. *Self-Esteem, School Interest, and Acceptance of Others as a Function of Demographic Categorization.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-24, 170)

_________ Reardon, Francis J. "Racial Balancing in Harrisburg, Achievement and Attitudinal Changes," *Integrated Education,* 12 (September-October 1974) 37-38

Begab, Michael J. "The Major Dilemma of Mental Retardation: Shall We Prevent It? (Some Social Implications of Research in Mental Retardation)," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency,* 78 (March 1974)

Bell, John A. "Race and School Suspensions in Dallas," *Integrated Education,* 11 (March-April 1973)

Belles, A. Gilbert. "Negroes Are Few on College Faculties," *Southern Education Report,* 4 (July-August 1968)

Berbusse, Edward J. *The United States in Puerto Rico, 1898-1900,* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1966

Bereiter, Carl. "A Nonpsychological Approach to Early Compensatory Education," pp. 337-46 in Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race and Psychological Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Berk, Richard A. and Alice Hartmann. "Race and School Funds in Chicago, 1971," *Integrated Education,* 10 (January-February 1972) 52-57

Berlin, I. N. "Desegregation Creates Problems, Too," *Saturday Review,* June 15, 1963

Berls, Robert H. "Higher Education Opportunity and Achievement in the United States," in U.S. Congress, 91st, 1st session, Joint Economic Committee, *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States. A Compendium of Papers..* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969

Bertou, Patrick and Robert E. Clasen. "An Analysis of a Spanish Translation of the Sixteen Personality Factors Test," *Journal of Experimental Education,* 39 (Summer 1971) 13-21

Biener, Lois and Harold B. Gerard. "Effects of Desegregation on Achievement Relevant Motivation," unpublished, 1974

Bienvenu, Sr., Millard J. *Effects of School Integration on the Self-Concept and Anxiety of Lower-Class, Negro Adolescent Males.* Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 671)

Bigglestone, W. E. "Oberlin College and the Negro Student, 1865-1940," *Journal of Negro History,* 56 (July 1971)

Bikson, Kay, Michel Thelia, Harold B. Gerard and Erhan Yasar. "School Desegregation and Children's Speech Properties," unpublished, 1974

Billington, Ray Allen (ed.). *A Free Negro in the Slave Era. The Journal of Charlotte L. Forten,* (New York: Collier, 1961)

Bindman, Aaron M. *Participation of Negro Students in an Integrated University.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1965. (University Microfilms Order No. 65-7076)

__________. "Pre-College Preparation of Negro College Students" *Journal of Negro Education,* (Fall 1966)

Binet, Alfred and Theodore Simon. *The Development of Intelligence in Children (The Binet-Simon Scale),* Tr. Elizabeth S. Kite (Vineland, N.J.: The Training School at Vineland, 1916)

__________. *The Intelligence of the Feeble-Minded,* Tr. Elizabeth S. Kite, (Vineland, N.J.: Training School at Vineland, 1916)

Binkley, Marvin Edward. *First Grade Entrance Variable Related to Achievement and Personality, A Study of Culturally Deprived Fourth Graders.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1967. (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 773)

"Black and White at Northwestern University," *Integrated Education,* 6 (1968)

Blake, Jr. Elias. *A Comparison of Intraracial and Interracial Levels of Aspiration.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1960. (University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616)

__________. *A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,* unpublished paper prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

Blassingame, John W. "Before the Ghetto: The Making of the Black Community in Savannah, Georgia, 1865-1880," *Journal of Social History,* 6 (Summer 1973)

Bloom, Benjamin S. "Implications of the IEA Studies for Curriculum and Instruction," *School Review,* 82 (May 1974) 413-35

Boas, Franz. *The Mine of Primitive Man,* rev. ed. New York: Free Press, 1963, orig. 1938; 1st ed., 1911

__________. "Race and Progress" in *Language and Culture,* New York: Macmillan, 1940

Bond, Horace Mann. *The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order,* New York: Octagon Books, 1966, orig. 1934

__________. "The Evolution and Present Status of Negro Higher and Professional Education in the United States," *Journal of Negro Education,* 17 (Summer 1948)

__________. "The Extent and Character of Separate Schools in the United States," *Journal of Negro Education,* July 1935

__________. "Intelligence Tests and Propaganda," *Crisis,* 28 (June 1924)

__________. "The Negro Common School in Oklahoma," *Crisis,* (July 1928)

__________. "The Present Status of Racial Integration in the United States, With Special Reference to Education," *Journal of Negro Education* (Summer 1952)

__________. "Self Respect as a Factor in Racial Advancement," *Annals,* 140 (1928)

__________. "What the Army 'Intelligence' Tests Measured," *Opportunity,* 2 (July 1924)

Boney, J. Don. "Some Dynamics of Disadvantaged Students in Learning Situations," *Journal of Negro Education,* Summer 1967

Boone, W. H. "Problems of Adjustment of Negro Students at a White School," *Journal of Negro Education,* October 1942

Borowitz, Gene H. and Hirsch, Jay G. *A Development Typology of Disadvantaged Four-Year-Olds.* Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, March 21, 1968

Bosco, James and Stanley Robin. "White Flight from Court-Ordered Busing?" *Urban Education,* 9 (April 1974)

Bowles, Frank and Frank A. De Costa. *Between Two Worlds, A Profile of Negro Higher Education,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971

Bowles, Frank Louis. *Sub-Test Score Changes Over Twenty Months on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children for White and Negro Special Education Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-10, 976)

Bowman, Orrin H. *Scholastic Development of Disadvantaged Negro Pupils: A Study of Pupils in Selected Segregated and Desegregated Elementary Classrooms.* Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1973. (University Microfilms Order No. 73-19, 176)

Boyce, George A. *When Navajos Had Too Many Sheep. The 1940's.,* San Francisco, Calif.: Indian Historian Press, 1974

Boyd, G. F. "The Levels of Aspiration of White and Negro Children in a Non-Segregated Elementary School," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 1952

Braccio, John H. *A Comparative Study of School Self-Concept Between Low Socio-Economic Fifth and Sixth Grade Chicanos and Anglo-Americans.* Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-16, 395)

Bradley, Gladyce H. "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Negro Education*, Winter 1964

Bradley, Jr., Nolen E. *The Negro Undergraduate Student: Factors Relative to Performance in Predominantly White State Colleges and Universities in Tennessee.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12, 606

Brant, C. S. and C. W. Hobart. "Sociocultural Conditions and Consequences of Native Education in the Arctic: A Cross-National Comparison," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association, November 18-21, 1965

Braxton, Mary Victoria and Charles S. Bullock III. "Teacher Partiality in Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, 10 (July-August 1972)

"Breaking Down the Barriers of Discrimination in Higher Education," *School and Society*, 67 (February 14, 1948)

Bremner, Robert H. and others (eds.) *Children and Youth in America. A Documentary History, I: 1600-1865*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970

Bridgette, Richard Evan. *Self-Esteem in Negro and White Southern Adolescents.* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-21, 175)

Brieland, Donald. "Black Identity and the Helping Person," *Children*, 16 (September-October 1969)

Briggs, Delores Griffin. *Deviations from Standard English in Papers of Selected Alabama Negro High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-6528)

Brigham, Carl C. "Intelligence Tests on Immigrant Groups," *Psychological Review*, 37 (January 1930), p. 165

________. *A Study of American Intelligence*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1923

________. *A Study of Error*, New York: College Entrance Examination Board 1932

Brimmer, Andrew. "The Economic Outlook and the Future of the Negro College," *Daedalus*, 100 (Summer 1971)

________. "Education and Income in the Black Community," *Integrated Education*, 11 (November-December 1973)

________. "Education and the Economic Advancement of Minority Groups," *Integrated Education*, (March-April 1970)

________. "Employment Patterns and the Dilemma of Desegregation," *Integrated Education*, (October-November 1967)

Brindley, Fern Belle. *Social Factors Influencing Educational Aspiration of Black and White Girls.* Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 71-1648)

Brink, William and Louis Harris. *The Negro Revolution in America*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964

Brook, Judith S., Martin Whiteman, Estelle Peisach, and Martin Deutsch. "Aspiration Levels of and for Children: Age, Sex, Race, and Socioeconomic Correlates," *Journal of General Psychology*, 124 (1974)

Brookover, W. B., Richard Gigliotti, Ronald Henderson, and Jeffery Schneider. *A Brief Description of a Study of Elementary School Social Climates and School Achievement*, undated

Brooks, Bernice Demsky. *A Study of Ninety-Five Children Traveling by Bus to a K-5 School as Part of the Open Enrollment Program in a Large Urban School System.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 71-8957)

Brophy, William A. and Sophie D. Aberle (compilers). "Education," chapter 5 in *The Indian. America's Unfinished Business*, Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966

Brown, Bert R. *The Assessment of Self-Concept Among Four-Year-Old Negro and White Children: A Comparative Study Using the Brown-IDS Self Concept Referents Test.* New York: Institute for Developmental Studies, New York University, 1966

Brown, Josephine to Samuel J. May, April 27, 1854, Carter G. Woodson (ed.) *The Mind of the Negro As Reflected in Letters Written during the Crisis 1800-1860.* Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926, p. 364.

Brown, Ina Corinne and others. *National Survey of Higher Education of Negroes, II,* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942-1943

Brown, Robert G. "A Comparison of the Vocational Aspirations of Paired Sixth-Grade White and Negro Children Who Attend Segregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research,* May-June 1965

Bryant, James Chester. *Some Effects of Racial Integration of High School Students on Standardized Achievement Test Scores, Teacher Grades, and Dropout Rates in Angleton, Texas.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-678)

Bryde, John F. "A New Approach to Indian Education," *Integrated Education,* September-October 1968

________. *The Sioux Indian Student: A Study of Scholastic Failure and Personality Conflict,* Pine Ridge, S. Dak. 57770: Holy Rosary Mission, 1966

Buchheimer, Naomi and Arnold. *Equality through Integration. A Report on Greenburgh School District No. 8.* New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1965

Buck, Mildred R. "Self-Esteem as a Relevant Psychological Factor," *Contemporary Psychology,* 19 (1974)

________, and Harvey R. Austrin. "Factors Related to School Achievement in An Economically Disadvantaged Group," *Child Development,* 42 (December 1971)

Bullock, Paul with Jacobo Rodriquez. *Aspiration vs. Opportunity: "Careers" in the Inner City.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1973

Bullough, Bonnie Louise. *Alienation Among Middle Class Negroes: Social-Psychological Factors Influencing Housing Desegregation.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-16, 517)

________. "Alienation and School Segregation," *Integrated Education,* (March-April 1972)

________. "Alienation in the Ghetto," *American Journal of Sociology,* 72 (1966-1967)

Bunger, Marianna. *Teaching Alaskan Native Youth.* 1970. ERIC ED 045 588

Bunton, Peter L. and Theodore A. Weissbach. "Attitudes Toward Blackness of Black Preschool Children Attending Community-Controlled or Public Schools," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 92 (1974)

Burnes, Donna Kay Standley. "Patterns of WISC Scores for Children of Two Socioeconomic Classes and Races," *Child Development,* 41 (1970), 493-499

________. *A Study of Relationships Between Measured Intelligence and Non-Intellective Factors for Children of Two Socioeconomic Groups and Races.* Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8989)

Burt, Cyril. "Inheritance of General Intelligence," *American Psychologist,* 27 (March 1972) 175-190

Bush, Lurlene. *Final Evaluation Report, Emergency School Aid Act, School Year 1973-74, Section VII: ESAA Counseling Program (Need #2,)* San Francisco, California: San Francisco Unified School District, July 1974

Busk, Patricia L., Robin C. Ford, and Jerome L. Schulman. "Effects of Schools' Racial Composition on the Self-Concept of Black and White Students," *Journal of Educational Research,* 67 (October 1973)

Butler, Jr., Oscar Perry. *A Comparative Study of the Self-Concept of Black and White Freshman Students from the Midwest and South.* Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, (University Microfilms Order No. 71-2041)

Butts, Hugh H. "Skin Color Perception and Self-Esteem," *Journal of Negro Education,* 32 (Spring 1963)

Buzbee, Ellen W. *Suburban Schools Confront Urban Problems,* White Plains, New York: American Jewish Committee, 1968

Byalick, Robert Lawrence. *Expressed Preference and Observed Use of Positive Reinforcement in Biracial Classrooms.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972. (University Microfilm Order No. 73-5660)

________ and Donald N. Bersoff. "Reinforcement Practices of Black and White Teachers in Integrated Classrooms," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 66 (1974)

Caffrey, Bernard, Simms Anderson II, and Janet Garrison. "Change in Racial Attitudes of White Southerners After Exposure to the Atmosphere of a Southern University," *Psychological Reports*, 25 (1969)

——— and Clarice Jones. "Racial Attitudes of Southern High School Seniors," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 79 (1969)

Caley, Barbara. "How a School Fails," *Integrated Education*, 7 (September-October 1969)

California State Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Educational Neglect of Mexican American Students in the Lucia Mar Unified School District, Pismo Beach, California*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, January 1973

California State Department of Education. *Racial and Ethnic Survey of California Public Schools, Part One: Distribution of Pupils*, Fall 1966, Sacramento: California State Department of Education, March 1967

Caplin, Morris D. "The Relationship Between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Experimental Education*, 37 (1969)

———. *The Relationship Between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement and Between Level of Aspiration and Academic Achievement*. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966. (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10, 284)

———. "Self-Concept, Level of Aspiration, and Academic Achievement," *Journal of Negro Education*, Fall 1968

Carpenter, Thomas R. and Thomas V. Busse. "Development of Self-Concept in Negro and White Welfare Children," *Child Development*, 40 (1969)

Carter, Robert L. "The Warren Court and Desegregation," *Michigan Law Review*, 67 (1968-1969)

Carwise, Joseph L. *Aspirations and Attitudes Toward Education of Over-and Under-Achieving Negro Junior High School Students*. Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-4711)

Caspar, Margery G. "The Education of Menominee Youth in Wisconsin," *Integrated Education*, 11 (January-February 1973)

Caspari, Ernst W. "Behavioral Consequence of Genetic Differences in Man: A Summary," p. 275 in J. N. Spuhler (ed.) *Genetic Diversity and Human Behavior*, Chicago, Ill.: Aldine, 1967

Cavalli-Sforza, L.I. "Statement," U.S. Congress, *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement*, below

Centra, John A., Robert L. Linn, and Mary Ellen Parry. "Academic Growth in Predominantly Negro and Predominantly White Colleges," *American Educational Research Journal*, 7 (January 1970)

Central Advisory Council for Education. *Children and Their Primary Schools*, I (London: HMSO, 1967)

Chandler, John T. and John Plakos. "Spanish-Speaking Pupils Classified as Educable Mentally Retarded," *Integrated Education*, 7 (1969)

Cherry, Frank T. *Southern In-Migrant Negroes in North Lawndale, Chicago 1949-59: A Study of Internal Migration and Adjustment*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965

Chesler, Mark A. "Interaction and Teaching Alternatives in Desegregated Classrooms," pp. 90-125, *Racial Crisis in American Education*, ed. by Robert Lee Green (Chicago: Follet, 1969)

———. *Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms*, unpublished paper prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-17, 1967

———, Judith Guskin, and Phyllis Erenberg. *Planning Educational Change*, Vol. II: *Human Resources in School Desegregation*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969

——— and Phyllis Segal. *Characteristics of Negro Students Attending Previously All-White Schools in the Deep South*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, September 1967)

"The Chicago Title VI Complaint to H.E.W. *Integrated Education*, 3 (December 1965-January 1966)

Choldin, Harvey M. *First Year in the Metropolis: A Study of Migration and Adjustment*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965

Christmas, June Jackson. "Self-Concept and Attitudes," in Kent S. Miller and Ralph M. Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States*, New York: Seminar Press, 1973

Clark, Edward T., Richard J. Ozenhosky, Anita I. Barz, and John V. O'Leary. "Self Concept and Vocabulary Development in Negro and White Pre-School Children," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, April, 1967

Clark, El Nadal. *Analysis of the Differences Between Pre-and Post Test Scores (Change Scores) on Measures of Self-Concept Academic Aptitude, and Reading Achievement Earned by Sixth Grade Students Attending Segregated and Desegregated Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1971. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-307)

Clark, Kenneth B. "Cultural Deprivation Theories: Their Social and Psychological Implications," p. 7 in *The Educationally Deprived, The Potential for Change.* New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center, 1972

__________. "Issues in Urban Education," in James Haskins (ed.), *Black Manifesto for Education.* New York: Morrow, 1973

__________ "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Preschool children," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 10 (1939)

__________ and Mamie K. Clark. "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children," *Journal of Negro Education,* 19 (1950)

__________ and __________. "Segregation as A Factor in the Racial Identification of Negro Pre-School Children: A Preliminary Report," *Journal of Experimental Education,* 8 (1939-1940)

__________ and __________. "Skin Color As a Factor in Racial Identification of Negro Preschool Children," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 11 (1940)

__________ and Lawrence Plotkin. *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges.* New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963

Clarke, Lillian W. "Race and Suspension in New Orleans," *Integrated Education,* 11 (May-June 1973)

Claye, Clifton M. "Problems of Cross-Over Teachers," *Integrated Education* 8 (September-October 1970)

__________. *A Study of the Relationship Between Self-Concepts and Attitudes Toward the Negro Among Secondary School Pupils in Three Schools of Arkansas.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1958

Coates, Brain. "White Adult Behavior Toward Black and White Children," *Child Development,* 43 (1972)

Coats, William D., James W. Booth and David E. Bartz. *A Longitudinal Study of Desegregation in Kalamazoo, Michigan,* September 7, 1972. Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association.

Cochran, S.B. and Thomas M. Uhlman. "Black Populations and School Integration – A Research Note," *Phylon,* 34 (March 1973)

Coffman, William E. and Lai-Min Paul Lee. "Cross-National Assessment of Educational Achievement: A Review," *Educational Researcher,* 3 (June 1974)

Cohen, Elizabeth G. "Interracial Interaction Disability," *Human Relations,* 25 (1972) 9-24

__________. "Modifying the Effects of Social Structure," *American Behavioral Scientist,* 16 (July-August 1973) 861-879

__________ and Susan S. Roper. "Modification of Interracial Interaction Disability: An Application of Status Characteristics Theory," *American Sociological Review,* 37 (December 1972) 643-657

Felix S. Cohen's Handbook of Federal Indian Law. Albuquerque, N.Mex.: University of New Mexico Press, 1971, orig. 1942

Cole, Spurgeon, Jay Steinberg, and G. J. Burkheimer. "Prejudice and Conservatism in a Recently Integrated Southern College," *Psychological Reports,* 23 (1968)

Coleman, James S. *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity,* unpublished paper read at a conference of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, October 21, 1967

__________. "Equalizing Achievement–A False Ideal?" *Miami Herald,* August 12, 1973

__________. *Race Relations and Social Change* (Baltimore, Maryland Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, John Hopkins University, July 1967)

__________, Campbell, Ernest Q., Hobson, Carol J., McParland, James, Mood, Alexander M., Weinfeld, Frederick D., and York, Robert L. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

Coles, Robert. *Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear,* Boston: Little, Brown, 1967

Colfax, J. David. "The Cognitive Self-Concept and School Segregation: Some Preliminary Findings," p. 109, in William W. Brickman and Stanley

Stanley Lehrer (eds.) *Education and the Many Faces of the Disadvantaged: Culturel and Historical Perspectives,* New York: Wiley, 1972

Colston, James A. *State Financial Support of Higher Education in Georgia from 1932 to 1949 with Specific Reference to Higher Education for the Negro.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1958. (University Microfilms Order No. 2177)

Comber, L.C. and John P. Keeves. *Science Education in Nineteen Countries. An Empirical Study*, New York: Wiley, 1973

Comer, James P. Beyond Black and White, New York: Quadrangle, 1972

Commission on Secondary Schools. *Progress and Plans of Negro High Schools Toward Regional Accreditment.* N.p.: Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes, 1945

Committee on Race and Education. *Race and Equal Educational Opportunity in Portland's Public Schools.* Portland, Oreg.: Board of Education, Oct. 29, 1964

Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Justice. *Report of the . . . Student Unrest Survey.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, September 1969

Comptroller General of the United States. *Opportunity to Improve Indian Education in Schools Operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.* Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, April 27, 1972

Conant, James Bryant. *Shaping Educational Policy.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964

Connecticut Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *El Boricua: The Puerto Rican Community in Bridgeport and New Haven.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Janaury 1973

Coombs, L. Madison, Ralph E. Kron, E. Gordon Collister, and Kenneth E. Anderson. *The Indian Child Goes to School A Study of Interracial Differences.* Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1958

Cordova, Ignacio Ruben. *The Relationship of Acculturation, Achievement, and Alienation Among Spanish American Sixth Grade Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17, 727)

Corrigan, Francis Vincent. *A Comparison of Self Concepts of American Indian Students from Public or Federal School Backgrounds.* Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-24,959)

Corrigan, Patricia and David Aberdeen. *Some Early Effects of Compulsory Desegregation on Elementary School Children.* March 1970 ERIC ED 038-658

Corwin, Ronald G. *Reform and Organizational Survival. The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change.* New York: Wiley, 1973

——— and Marilyn Schmit. "Teachers in Inner City Schools: A Survey of a Large City School System'" *Theory Into Practice,* 8 (1969)

Cosby, Arthur. "Black-White Differences in Aspirations Among Deep South High School Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* 40 (Winter 1971)

Cota-Robles de Suarez, Cecilia. "Skin Color as a Factor of Racial Identification and Preference of Young Chicano Children," *Aztlan,* 2 (Spring 1971)

Coursin, David Baird. "Nutrition and Brain Development in Infants," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* 18 (April 1972) 177-202

Cox, Oliver C. *Caste, Class, and Race: A Study in Social Dynamics,* New York: Monthly Review Press, 1959, orig. 1948

Crain, Robert L. "School Integration and Occupational Achievement of Negroes," *American Journal of Sociology,* 75 (1969-1970)

——— "School Integration and the Academic Achievement of Negroes," *Sociology of Education,* 44 (1971)

———. *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of Desegregation,* I (Chicago, Ill.: National Opinion Research Center, October 1973) ERIC ED 085 426

——— and Carol Sachs Weisman. *Discrimination, Personality, and Achievement, A Survey of Northern Blacks* (New York: Seminar Press, 1972)

——— and others. *The Effects of DeFacto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities,* unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966)

Cramer, M. Richard, Charles E. Bowerman and Ernest Q. Campbell. *Social Factors in Educational Achievement and Aspirations Among Negro Adolescents,* 2 vols. Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, University of North Carolina, 1966

Criswell, Joan H. *A Sociometric Study of Race Cleavage in the Classroom,* New York: Archives of Psychology, January 1939

Crockett, David A. *An Inquiry Into the Integration of the Chippewa Indian in the Secondary Schools of Northern Minnesota.* Master's thesis, St. Cloud State College, 1967

Cronbach, Lee and P. J. D. Drenth (eds.). *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation,* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton, 1972

Cross, John F. and Jane Cross. "Age, Sex, Race, and the Perception of Facial Beauty," *Developmental Psychology,* 5 (1971)

Crow, James F. "Genetic Theories and Influences: Comments on the Value of Diversity," *Harvard Educational Review,* 39 (Spring 1969)

Crowley, Mary R. "Cincinnati's Experiment in Negro Education: A Comparative Study of the Segregated and Mixed School," *Journal of Negro Education,* 1 (1932)

Crummell, Alexander. *The Attitude of the American Mind Toward the Negro Intellect.* The American Negro Academy, Occasional Papers, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: The Academy, 1898)

Culbertson, Mamie. *Diary of a Crossover Teacher* Gretna, La.: Pelican Publishing Company, 1972

Curtis, Byron William. *The Effects of Segregation on the Vocational Aspirations of Negro Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 605)

Cytrynbaum, Solomon. *Race of Teacher, Task and Affective Interaction in Southern Black College Classes.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-14, 834)

Dambacher, Arthur D. *Report of Group Achievement Tests for 1970-1971.* Berkeley, Calif. Berkeley Unified District, 1971

Darden, Joe T. *Afro-Americans in Pittsburgh. The Residential Segregation of a People.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973

Dasen, Pierre R. "The Development of Conservation in Aboriginal Children. A Replication Study," *International Journal of Psychology,* 7 (1972)

__________, DeLacy, P.R., and Seagrim, G.N. "An Investigation of Reasoning Ability in Adopted and Fostered Aboriginal Children," in G.E. Kearney, DeLacey and Davidson (eds.), *The Psychology of Aboriginal Australians,* New York: Wiley, 1974

Datcher, Erselle, James E. Savage, Jr., and Stephen F. Checkosky. "School Type, Grade, Sex, and Race of Experimenter as Determinants of Racial Preference and Awareness in Black and White Children," *American Psychological Association Proceedings,* 8 (1973)

Datta, Lois-ellin, Earl Schaefer, and Malcom Davis. *Sex and Scholastic Aptitude as Variables in Teachers' Ratings of the Adjustment and Classroom Behavior of Negro and Other Seventh Grade Students,* 1966, p. 20. ERIC ED 028 206 See, also, *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 59 (1968) 94-101

Davidson, Helen H. and Judith W. Greenberg. *Traits of School Achievers from a Deprived Background.* May 1967. ERIC ED 013 849

Davies, Jr., Earnest A. *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Transported and Non-Transported Pupils at Holly Hill Elementary School, Holly Hill, Florida.* Master's thesis, Stetson University, 1969

Davis, James A. "Busing," in Robert L. Crain (ed.), *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation,* October, 1973 ERIC ED 085 426

Davis, O.L. and Carl R. Personke, Jr. "Effects of Administering the *Metropolitan Readiness Test* in English and Spanish to Spanish-Speaking School Entrants," *Journal of Educational Measurement,* 5 (1971)

Day, Noel. "The Freedom Movement in Boston," *Integrated Education,* 2 (December-January 1965)

De Anda, Diane. "Chicanito in Checkmate," *Edcentric,* October-November 1972

Dearborn, Walter F. and Howard H. Long. "The Physical and Mental Abilities of the American Negro: A Critical Summary," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3 (July 1934)

DeAvila, Edward A. and Barbara Havassy. "A Piagetian Approach to IQ: A Mexican-American Study," 1974, unpublished paper

De Costa, Frank A. "The Tax-Supported College for Negroes," *Journal of Educational Sociology,* 22 (February 1958)

Degler, Carl N. "Indians and Other Americans," *Commentary,* 54 (November 1972)

De Leon, Naphtale. *Chicanos, Our Background and Our Pride,* 1972 Trucha Publications, P.O. Box 5223, Lubbock, Tex. 79417

Denmark, Florence L. "The Effect of Integration on Academic Achievement and Self-Concept," *Integrated Education,* 8 May-June 1970)

__________ and Marcia Guttentag. "Effect of Integrated and Non-Integrated Programs on Cognitive Change in Pre-School Children," *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 29 (1969), 379

__________, __________ and Robert Riley. *Communication Patterns in Integrated Classrooms and Pre-Integration Subject Variables as They Affect the Academic Achievement and Self-Concept of Previously Segregated Children.* August 1967. ERIC ED 016 721

Dennis, Wayne. "Racial Change in Negro Drawings," *Journal of Psychology,* 69 (1968)

Dentler, Robert A. "A Basis for Classifying Ethnic Composition of Schools," Memorandum No. 5 of the *Education Complex Study.* New York: Center for Urban Education

Derbyshire, Robert L. "Adolescent Identity Crisis in Urban Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles," in *Minority Group Adolescents in the United States,* ed. by Eugene B. Brody. Baltimore, Md.: Williams and Wilkins, 1968

__________. *Personal Identity: An Attitude Study of American Negro College Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1964. (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 098)

Deslonde, James L. "How Can We Really Integrate the Schools?" *Integrated Education,* 10 (May-June 1972)

__________ and Elizabeth G. Flach. *The Cadre Approach to Teacher Training: Developing Change Agents for Desegregated Schools,* April 1972. ERIC ED 064 444

Development Associates, Inc. "Impact of School Desegregation on Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans," pp. 75-95 in Robert L. Crain and others, *Design for a National Longitudinal Study of School Desegregation,* Vol. I. *Issues in Theory and Method.* Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, September 1974

Diamant, Louis. "Relationships between Intelligence and Parental Attitudes and Race Awareness in Five-Year-Olds," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 77 (1969)

Diaz-Mora, Nelson. *The Availability and Adequacy of Some Spanish Translated Tests.* Master's thesis, Western Michigan University, 1969, (University Microfilms Order No. M 1832)

Dickinson, Dallas P. *"On Account He Ain't Had a Normal Home": An Intellectual History of the Concept of "Disadvantagness" in Education.* Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1973. (University Microfilms Order No. 73-30, 573)

Dilling, H. J. "Educational Achievement and Social Acceptance of Indian Pupils Integrated in Non-Indian Schools of Southern Ontario," *Ontario Journal of Educational Research,* Autumn 1965

Division of Educational Research. *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration 1971-71.* San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972

Dixon, Clarence Curtis. *A Comparative Study of the Self-Concepts of Disadvantaged Negro Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-34, 065)

Dobin, Daniel. *The Failure of Academic High Schools in New York City.* Brooklyn, N.Y.: Brooklyn Education Task Force, 1970

Dobzhansky, Theodosius. *Genetic Diversity and Human Equality.* New York: Basic Books, 1973

Doke, Larry A. and Todd R. Risley. "Some Discriminative Properties of Race and Sex for Children from an All-Negro Neighborhood," *Child Development* 43 (1972)

Donahue, Elayne Meyer. *A Study of the Preference of Negro and White Kindergarten Children for Picture Book Stories Which Feature Negro and White Story Characters.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 700-5838)

Dorr, Robin. "Ordeal by Desegregation," *Integrated Education,* 10 (July-August 1972)

Douglas, Leonard. *A Comparative Analysis of the Relationship Between Self-Esteem and Certain Selected Variables Among Youth from Diverse Racial Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969. (University Microfilm Order No. 70-14,501)

__________. "Negro Self-Concept: Myth or Reality?" *Integrated Education,* 9 (November-December 1971) 27-29

Douglass, Frederick to William Lloyd Garrison. January 27, 1846 reprinted in *Liberator,* February 27, 1846 __________to William Lloyd Garrison, May 23, 1846, *Liberator*, June 26, 1846

Downey, Matthew T. *Carl Campbell Brigham.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1961

Dracon, John. *The Extent of Bilingualism Among the Crow and the Northern Cheyenne Indian School Populations, Grades One Through Twelve.* March 1970. ERIC ED 044 205

Drake, St. Clair and Horace R. Cayton. *Black Metropolis: A Study of Negro Life in a Northern City,* 2 vols. New York: Harper and Row, 1962

Dreger, Ralph M. "Intellectual Functioning," in Kent S. Miller and Ralph M. Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States.* New York: Seminar Press, 1973

Dreyer, Philip H. *The Relation of Self-Esteem to Personal-Social Adjustment Among American Indian Students: The Personal-Social Adjustment of American Indian Youth.* September 1970. ERIC ED 045 276.

__________and Robert J. Havighurst. *The Self-Esteem of American Indian Youth. The Personal-Social Adjustment of American Indian Youth.* November 1970. ERIC ED 045 273

DuBois, W.E.B. "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?" *Journal of Negro Education,* July 1935

__________. "The Negro Common School in Mississippi," *Crisis* (September 1926)

__________. "Negroes in College," *Nation,* 112 (March 3, 1926)

. "A Negro Nation Within the Nation," *Current History,* 42 (June 1935)

__________. "Reconstruction and Its Benefits," *American Historical Review* (1909-1910)

__________. Review of A. D. Mayo, *The Mental Capacity of the American Negro in Journal of Philosophy,* 11 (September 24, 1914), 557-558

__________. "The Storm and Stress in the Black World," *Dial,* April 16, 1901

__________, (ed.). *The College-Bred Negro.* Atlanta, Ga.: Atlanta University Press, 1900

__________and Augustus G. Dill (eds.) *The College-Bred Negro American.* Atlanta, Ga.: Atlanta University Press, 1910

Dumbarton Research Council. *Race and Education in the City of Oakland,* draft, unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Menlo Park, Calif.: Dumbarton Research Council, October 1966

Dunlop, G. M., R.J.C. Harper and S. Hurka. "The Influence of Transporting Children to Centralized Schools Upon Achievement and Attendance," *Educational Administration and Supervision,* 44 (July 1958) 191-198

Dunmore, Charlotte Jeanette. *Social-Psychological Factors Affecting the Use of an Educational Opportunity Program by Families Living in a Poverty Area.* Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, 1968. (University Microfilm Order No. 68-9928)

Dunn, Theodore F. *Assumed Racial Similarity as Related to Attitudes Toward Integration.* Doctoral dissertation, American University, 1958

Dunwell, Robert R., Doreen G. Kelgaard, David Raak, *et al. The Assessment of Informal Factors Affecting Teaching and Learning in a Ghetto High School, Denver, Colorado Manual High School,* 1971. ERIC ED 052 281

Durig, Kurt Robert. *A Study of Social Status and Occupational Choice Among High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2283)

Dwyer, Robert J. "A Report on Patterns of Interaction in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Sociology,* March 1958

Dyer, Patricia Jane. *Effects of Test Conditions on Negro-White Differences in Test Scores.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970. (University Microfilms Order No. 71-6166)

Eastland, James O. *The Supreme Court, Segregation, and the South.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954

Easton H. *A Treatise on the Intellectual Character and Civil and Political Condition of the Colored People of the United States; and the Prejudice Exercised Towards Them. . .* Boston, Mass.: Isaac Knapp, 1837

Edington, Everett D. Recruitment of Spanish-Speaking Students Into Higher Education, May 1969. ERIC ED 031 320

Educational Testing Service. *Invitational Papers Submitted to the Select Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives,* March, 1971. ERIC ED 051 314

Edwards, Babette. "Trouble in I.S. 201," *Integrated Education,* 9 (July-August 1971)

Edwards, Curtis Drew. *Stress in the School: A Study of Anxiety and Self-Esteem in Black and White Elementary School Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-31, 394)

Edwards, Daniel W. " 'Black versus Whites' When Is Race a Relevant Variable?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 29 (1974)

Edwards, Ozzie L. "Skin Color as a Variable in Racial Attitudes of Black Urbanites," *Journal of Black Studies,* 3 (June 1973)

Edwards, T. Bentley. "Teacher Attitudes and Cultural Differentiation," *Journal of Experimental Education,* Winter 1966

Egerton, John. "Inflated Body Count," *Change* (July-August 1970)

Eisenberg, Carolyn Woods. *The Parents Movement at I.S. 201: From Integration to Black Power, 1958-66: A Case Study of Developing Ideology.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1971. (University Microfilms Order No. 74-14, 860)

Elias, M.F. "Disciplinary Barriers to Progress in Behavior Genetics: Defensive Reactions to Bits and Pieces," *Human Development,* 16 (1973)

Elkind, David, Introduction to Jean Piaget, *Six Psychological Studies.* New York: Vintage Books, 1968

Elliott, David Henry. *Social Origins and Values of Teachers and Their Attitudes to Students from Poverty Backgrounds.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-12, 669)

Elliott, Merle H. and Alden W. Badal. "Achievement and Racial Composition of Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research,* September 1965

Ellis, Desmond P. and James W. Wiggins. *Cooperation, Aggression and Learning in a Bi-racial Classroom (The Socialization of Academic Behavior Among Negro Junior High School Students).* September 1968. ERIC ED 026 442

Elshorst, Hansjorg. "Two Years After Integration: Race Relations at a Deep South University," *Phylon,* Spring 1967

Entwisle, Doris R. and Greenberger, Ellen. *Differences in the Language of Negro and White Grade School Children 1,* 2 (May 1968) ERIC ED 019 676

________and ________. *A Survey of Cognitive Style in Maryland Ninth-Graders: III. Feelings of Control Over Academic Achievement.* Baltimore, Maryland: Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, August 1970

________and Murray Webster, Jr. "Expectations in Mixed Racial Groups," *Sociology of Education* 47 (Summer 1974)

________and ________. "Raising Children's Performance Expectations," *Social Science Research,* 1 (1972)

Eppes, John Williford. *The Effect of Varying the Race of the Experimenter on the Level of Aspirations of Externally-Controlled Inner City School Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-13, 750)

Epps, Edgar G. *Family and Achievement: A Study of the Relation of Family Background to Achievement Orientation and Performance Among Urban Negro High School.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, February 1969

________. "Impact of School Desegregation on Aspirations, Self-Concepts and Other Aspects of Personality," Unpublished, 1974

________. "Interpersonal Relations and Motivation: Implications for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (1970)

EQUAL. "Observing a Princeton Plan in Operation," *EQUAL Newsletter, June 1964*

Erickson, Donald A. and Henrietta Schwartz. "What Rough Rock Demonstrates," *Integrated Education,* 8 (March-April 1970)

________and , with Oswald Werner. *Community School at Rough Rock.* April 1969, section 3.30 (A Report Submitted to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Contract No. B89-45 34)

Erikson, Erik H. "A Memorandum on Identity and Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues,* 20 (1964)

Escoffery, Aubrey Spencer. *Personality and Behavior Correlates of Negro American Belief in "Fate-Control".* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1967. (University of Microfilms Order No. 68-1341)

Evaluation of Desegregation 1970-71. Miami, Fla.: Dade County Public Schools, June 1972

Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation Data from Integration 1971-72. San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972

Evans, Charles Lee. *The Immediate Effects of Classroom Integration on the Academic Progress, Self-Concept, and Racial Attitude of Negro Elementary Children.* Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1969. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-9127

__________. *Integration Evaluation.* Fort Worth, Tex.: Fort Worth Independent School District, August 15, 1973

__________. *Short-Term Desegregation Effects: The Academic Achievement of Bused Students, 1971-72.* Fort Worth, Tex.: Fort Worth Independent School District, January 1973

Evans, Rupert N. and Joel D. Galloway. "Verbal Ability and Socioeconomic Status of 9th and 12th Grade College Preparatory, General, and Vocational Students," *Journal of Human Resources,* 9 (1973)

Fainstein, Susan F. *The Movement for Community Control of Schools in New York City.* Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1971

Fancher, Betsy. *Voices from the South. Black Students Talk About Their Experiences in Desegregated Schools.* Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Council, August 1970

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks,* tr. Charles Lam Markmann, New York: Grove, 1967

Feagin, Joe Richard. *The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation.* Doctoral dissertation. Harvard University, March 1966

Feldman, Carol Fleischer, Benjamin Lee, James Dickson McLean, David B. Pillemer, and James R. Murray. *The Development of Adaptive Intelligence.* San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1974

Felice, Lawrence G. "Busing in Waco, Texas," *Integrated Education,* 12 (July-August 1974)

Ferguson, Harold A. and Richard L. Plaut. "Talent: To Develop or to Lose," *Educational Record,* April 1954

Fichter, Joseph H. *Graduates of Predominantly Negro Colleges, Class of 1964.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

__________. *Negro Women Bachelors. A Comparative Exploration of the Expectations and Experiences of College Graduates of the Class of June, 1961.* Chicago, Ill.: National Opinion Research Center, January 1965

__________. *Young Negro Talent–Survey of the Experiences and Expectations of Negro Americans Who Graduated from College in 1961.* Chicago, Ill.: National Opinion Research Center, November 1964

Fish, Kenneth L. *Conflict and Dissent in the High Schools.* New York: Bruce, 1970

Fisher, David L. *Black Studies and the Enhancement of Self-Concept as It Relates to Achievement Level in Negro High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 73-9750)

Fishman, George. "Paul Robeson's Student Days and the Fight Against Racism at Rutgers," *Freedomways,* 9 (Summer 1969)

Fiss, Owen. "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Case–Its Significance for Northern School Desegregation," *University of Chicago Law Review,* 38 (Summer 1971)

__________. "Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools: The Constitutional Concepts," *Harvard Law Review* (January 1965)

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. *Puerto Rican Americans, The Meaning of Migration to the Mainland.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971

Flake, Tom. "Expenditures. Dollars on a Treadmill," p. 36 in Patrick McCauley and Edw. D. Ball (eds.), *Southern Schools: Progress and Problems.* Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1959

Flaugher, Ronald L. and Rock, Donald A. "Patterns of Ability Factors Among Four Ethnic Groups," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association,* 7 (1972)

Floyd, James A. *Self-Concept Development in Black Children.* Senior thesis in Psychology, Princeton University, May 5, 1969

Folger, John K., Helene S. Astin, and Alan E. Bayer. *Human Resources and Higher Education.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970

Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1970

Foner, Philip S. (ed.) *The Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass, 4 vols. New York: International, 1950*

Forbes, Gordon B. and Marilyn Gipson. "Political Attitudes and Opinions, Need for Social Approval. Dogmatism and Anxiety in Negro and White College Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Winter 1969

Fort, Edward B. *A Case Study of the Struggle to Secure an Administrative Plan for Eliminating De Facto Segregation in the Junior High School of Sacramento, California.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964. (University Microfilms Order No. 65-2985)

Fortenberry, James H. *The Achievement of Negro Pupils in Mixed and Non-Mixed Schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1959. (University Microfilms Order No. 59-5492

Foster, Herbert L. *Ribbin', Jivin', and Playin' the Dozens. The Unrecognized Dilemma of Inner City Schools.* Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger, 1974

Foster, Josephine A. *Variations in Levels of Aspirations of Children Grouped by Class, Race, Sex, and Grade Level.* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, 1964. (University Microfilms Order No. 70-16, 828)

Franklin, John Hope. *The Free Negro in North Carolina, 1790-1860.* New York: Russell and Russell, reprint 1969

________. "Jim Crow Goes to School: The Genesis of Legal Separation in the South," *South Atlantic Quarterly,* 58 (Spring 1959)

Franks, Bonita, B. *Some Social Determinants of Academic Success Among Culturally Disadvantaged Negro Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1967. (University Microfilms Order No. 68-8688)

Frary, Robert B. and Thomas M. Goolsby, Jr. "Achievement of Integrated and Segregated Negro and White First Graders in a Southern City," *Integrated Education,* 8 (July-August 1970)

Frazier, E. Franklin. "The Present State of Knowledge Concerning Race Relations," *Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology,* II. London: International Sociological Association, 1959

Freeman, Frank N. "The Interpretation of Test Results with Special Reference to Race Comparisons," *Journal of Negro Education* 3 (July 1934)

Frelow, Robert D. "Minority Administrators and Desegregation," *Integrated Education,* 11 (May-June 1973)

French, Jeana Turner. *Educational Desegregation and Selected Self-Concept Factors of Lower-Class Black Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72, 27, 914)

Frenkel, Sinai Israel. *A Comparison Between Negro and White College Students on Several Personality Measures.* Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1966

Friedman, Leon (ed.) *Argument: The Oral Argument Before the Supreme Court in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 1952-55.* New York: Chelsea House, 1969

Friend, Ronald M. and John M. Neale. "Children's Perceptions of Success and Failure: An Attributional Analysis of the Effects of Race and Social Class," *Developmental Psychology* 7 (1972)

Frisch, Giora R. and Leonard Handler. "Differences in Negro and White Drawings: A Cultural Interpretation," *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 24 (1967)

Galamison, Milton, In Melvin Urofsky (ed.) *Why Teachers Strike. Teachers' Rights and Community Control.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1970

Galarza, Ernesto. *Barrio Boy.* N.Y.: Ballantine Books, 1972

________. "The Mexican American Migrant Worker–Culture and Powerlessness," Integrated Education, 9 (March-April 1971)

Galvan, Robert Rogers. *Bilingualism As It Relates to Intelligence Test Scores and School Achievement Among Culturally-Deprived Spanish-American Children.* Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1131)

Gamboa, Erasmo. *Chicanos in the Northwest: A Historical Perspective,* 1971. (Montal Education Associates, 1700 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006)

Garrett, Henry E. *Desegregation: Fact and Hokum.* Richmond, Va.: Patrick Henry Press, 1962

________. "The Equalitarian Dogma," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 4 (1961)

———. "Garrett's Stuff," *Integrated Education*, 6 (March April 1968)

———. "How Classroom Desegregation Will Work," *Citizen*, 10 (October 1965)

———. "How Classroom Desegregation Works," *Citizen*, 10 (February 1966)

———. *IQ and Racial Differences.* Cape Canaveral, Fla.: Howard Allen Enterprises, 1973

———. *Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology. A Review.* Reprinted from *The Mankind Quarterly*, 1 (July 1969)

———. "Negro-White Differences in Mental Ability in the United States," *Scientific Monthly*, 65 (1947)

———. "THE S.P.S.S.I. and Racial Issues," *American Psychologist*, 17 (May 1962)

———. Testimony in *U.S. v. Hinds County* School District, October 8, 1968

———. and M.R.S. Schenck. *Psychological Tests, Methods, and Results.* New York: Harper & Row, 1933

Garth, Charles E. *Self-Concepts of Negro Students Who Transferred or Did Not Transfer to Formerly All-White High Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1963

Garth, Thomas R., Lovelady, Bert E., and Smith, Hale W. "The Intelligence and Achievement of Southern Negro Children," *School and Society*, 32 (1930)

Gates, Paul W. with a chapter by Robert W. Swenson, *History of Public Land Law Development.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, November 1968

Gates, Robbin L. *The Making of Massive Resistance. Virginia's Politics of Public School Desegregation, 1954-1956.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1964

Gay, Geneva. *Differential Dyadic Interactions of Black and White Teachers with Black and White Pupils in Recently Desegregated Social Studies Classrooms: A Function of Teacher and Pupil Ethnicity. Final Report*, January 1974. ERIC ED 091 489

Geiger, Otis Glenn. *Effects of Desegregation on Classroom Achievement.* Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1968. (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5796)

Geisel, Paul N. *I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison.* Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962. (University Microfilms Order No. 63-1838)

George, W. C. *Race, Heredity, and Civilization. Human Progress and the Race Problem*, 4th ed. London: Britons-Publishing Society, 1963: orig. 1961

Georgeoff, Peter John. *The Effect of the Curriculum Upon the Self-Concept of Children in Racially Integrated Fourth Grade Classrooms*, 1968. ERIC ED 017 020

Gerard, Harold B., Terrence D. Jackson, and Edward S. Conolley. *Social Contact in the Desegregated Classroom.* Unpublished, 1974

———and Bertram H. Raven. *Intervention Programs to Overcome Psycho-Social Deficits.* Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968

———, Harry Singer, and David Redfern. *Desegregation and the Achievement of White, Black and Mexican-American Pupils*, Unpublished, 1974

Gergen, Kenneth J. "Social Psychology as History," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 26 (1973) 309-320

Gerry, Martin H. *Cultural Freedom and the Rights of La Raza*, March 3, 1972

Ghee, Sandra Faye. *A Quantitative Study of Long Range Effects of Classroom Desegregation on Academic Progress, Self-Concept, and Racial Attitude of Black Junior-Senior High School Students.* Master's thesis, Texas Woman's University, 1972

Gibby, Sr., Robert G. and Robert Gabler. "The Self-Concepts of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23 (1967)

Gist, Noel P. and William S. Bennett. "Aspirations of Negro and White Students," *Social Forces*, October 1963

Gittell, Marilyn and others. *School Boards and School Policy. An Evaluation of Decentralization in New York City.* New York: Praeger, 1973

Gitter, A. George and Harvey Black. *Expression and Perception of Emotion: Race and Sex.* May 1968. ERIC ED 029 313

Glass, Thomas E. *A Descriptive and Comparative Study of American Indian Children in the Detroit Public Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972. (University Microfilms Order No. 72-28, 436)

Glick, Irving David. "Does Teacher's Skin Color Matter?" *Integrated Education*, 9 (September-October 1971)

Goering, John M. "Changing Perceptions and Evaluations of Physcial Characteristics Among Blacks: 1950-1970" *Phylon,* 33 (Fall 1972)

Goff, Regina M. "Some Educational Implications of the Influence of Rejection on Aspiration Levels of Minority Group Children," *Journal of Experimental Education,* December 1954

Goldberg, Faye, J. and Gloria Cowan. "Achievement Motivation and Fantasy Production as a Function of the Race and Sex of the TAT Figures," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, March 31, 1966

Goldberg, Herman R., John H. Griffith, Russell F. Green, and Orrin H. Bowman. *An Interim Report on a Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education.* Rochester, N.Y.: Board of Education, July 1969

Goldblatt, Harold S. and Cyril Tyson. *Some Self Perceptions and Teacher Evaluations of Puerto Rican, Negro, and White Pupils in 4th, 5th, and 6th grades.* Research Report No. 12. New York: City Commission on Human Rights, 1962

Golden, Gertrude. *Red Moon Called Me. Memoirs of a Schoolteacher in the Government Indian Service.* Ed. by Cecil Dryden. San Antonio, Tex.: Naylor, 1954

Goldin, Paul C. "A Model for Racial Awareness Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools," *Integrated Education,* 8 (1970) 62-64

Goldstein, Bernard, Harry C. Bredemeier, William M. Phillips, Jr. and Farlee, Coralie. *Social and Cultural Factors Related to School Achievement.* June 1967 ERIC ED 014 763

Goldstein, Rhoda L. (ed.) *Black Life and Culture in the United States.* New York: Crowell, 1971

Gomez, Anna Nieto and J. Anthony Vasquez. *The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus,* May 1969 ERIC ED 031 323

Gonzalez, Nancie L. *Positive and Negative Effects of Chicano Militancy on the Education of the Mexican American,* 1970 ERIC ED 061 004

Goodman, Mary Ellen. "Evidence Concerning the Genesis of Interracial Attitudes," *American Anthropologist,* 48 (1946)

__________and others. *The Mexican American Population of Houston: A Survey in the Field, 1965-1970,* 1971, ERIC ED 060 997

Goodman, Walter. "Busing for Integration Is Working Well in Central 7 School District—Knock Wood," *New York Times Magazine,* April 9, 1972

Goodrich, Andrew L., Lawrence W. Laziotte, and James A. Welch. "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey", *Community and Junior College Journal,* 43 (December 1972 - January 1973)

Goolsby, Jr., Thomas M. and Robert V. Frary. *Enhancement of Educational Effect Through Extensive and Intensive Intervention. The Gulfport Project.* Gulfport, Miss.: Gulfport Municipal Separate School District, July 1969

Gordon, Edmund W. "Equalizing Educational Opportunity in the Public School," *IRCD Bulletin,* November 1967

Gordon, John Edward, Jr. *The Effects on White Student Teachers of Value Clarification Interviews with Negro Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1965 (University Microfilms

Gordon, Leonard. *An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level.* Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-660)

__________. "The Carver-Oak Park Merger," *Integrated Education,* 3 (June-July 1965)

Gottesman, Irving I. "Biology, Social Structure and Equality," and "Statement" in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1972

Gottfried, Frances. "A Survey of Parental Views of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Experiment," *Community Issues,* 2 (October 1970)

Gottlieb, David. "Goal Aspirations and Goal Fulfillments: Differences Between Deprived and Affluent American Adolescents." Unpublished paper delivered at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 19, 1964

__________. "Poor Youth Do Want to Be Middle Class, But It's Not Easy," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* October 1967

_________. "Teaching and Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers," August, 1973. Later published in *Sociology of Education,* Summer 1964

Gouldner, Helen P. and others. *The Natural History of the Education of the Black Child in the City,* 1971 ERIC ED 061 395

Governor's Select Commission on Civil Disorder. "Newark's Decaying Public Schools," *Integrated Education,* 6 (March-April 1968)

Granger, Lester B. "Race Relations and the School System (A Study of Negro High School Attendance in New Jersey)", *Opportunity,* November 1, 1925

Grant, Carl A. "Black Studies Materials Do Make a Difference," *Journal of Educational Research,* 66 (May-June 1973)

Graves, Marian F. and Frederick D. Bedell. *A Three Year Evaluation of the White Plains Racial Balance Plan.* White Plains, N.Y.: Board of Education, October 16, 1967

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman. *The Mexican-American People. The Nation's Second Largest Minority.* New York: Free Press, 1970

Green, Richard B. and William D. Rohwer, Jr. "SES Differences on Learning and Ability Tests in Black Children," *American Educational Research Journal,* 8 (1971)

Green, Robert L., Joseph R. McMillan, and Thomas S. Gunnings. "Blacks in the Big Ten," *Integrated Education,* 10 (May-June 1972)

Green, Russel F. "On the Correlation Between I.Q. and Amount of 'White' Blood," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association,* 7 (1972) Part 1, 285-86

Greenberg, Jack. *Race Relations and American Law.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959

Greenberg, Norman C. *Administrative Problems Related to Integration of Navajo Indians in Public Education.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963. (University Microfilms Order No. 63-4883)

Greene, John F. and Perry Alan Zirkel. *Academic Factors Relating to the Self-Concept of Puerto Rican Pupils,* September 1971 ERIC ED 054 284

Greenwald, Herbert J., and Don B. Oppenheim. "Reported Magnitude of Self-Misidentification Among Negro Children–Artifact?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 8 (1968)

Gregor, A. James, and D. Angus McPherson. "Racial Attitudes Among White and Negro Children in a Deep South Standard Metropolitan Area," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 68 (1966)

Gregory, Karl D. "The Walkout: Symptom of Dying Inner City Schools," *New University Thought,* Spring 1967

Grier, Eunice S. *In Search of a Future. A Pilot Study of the Career-Seeking Experiences of Selected High School Graduates in Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, January 1963

Griffen, Joyce. *Family Structure and School Performance: A Comparative Study of Students From Three Ethnic Backgrounds in an Integrated School.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1965 (University Microfilms No. 65-13, 334

Griffin, Jack Leo. *The Effects of Integration on Academic Aptitude, Classroom Achievement, Self-Concept, and Attitudes Toward the School Environment of a Selected Group of Negro Students in Tulsa, Oklahoma.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tulsa, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17, 923)

Gross, Neal, Walter O. Jewell, III, Ralph G. Lewis, and Eigil D. Pederson. "Some Sociological Correlates of the 'Academic Productivity' of Urban Elementary Schools with Pupils from Families of Low Socio-Economic Status," unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1966

Guggenheim, Fred. "Self-Esteem and Achievement Expectations for White and Negro Children," *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment,* 33 (1969)

Gunn, James A. *An Investigation of the Scholastic Success of American Indian Children in the Sacramento City Schools.* Master's thesis, Sacramento State College, 1970

Gunthorpe, Muriel B. *A Comparison of Negro and White Student Participation in Selected Classes of a Junior High School Program.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1964 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-8477)

Gurin, Patricia, Gerald Gurin, Rosina C. Lao and Muriel Beattie. "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969)

_________ and Daniel Katz. *Motivation and Aspiration in the Negro College,* November 1966 ERIC ED 010 537

Gustafson, Richard A. and Thomas R. Owens. *The Self-Concept of Mexican-American Youngsters and Related Environmental Characteristics,* April 30, 1971 ERIC ED 053 195

Guthrie, James W., George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout. *Schools and Inequality.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1971

Guttentag, Marcia. "Children in Harlem's Community Controlled Schools," *Journal of Social Issues,* 28 (1972)

Guzman, Jessie P. *Twenty Years of Court Decisions Affecting Higher Education in the South, 1938-1958.* Tuskegee, Ala.: Tuskegee Institute, 1960

Hader, R. J. "Random Roommate Pairings of Negro and White Students," *American Statistician,* 21 (1967)

Hagar, Mary C. Williamson. *The Extent of Negro Student Involvement in an Integrated High School.* Master's thesis, Virginia State College, June 1969

Haggard, Ernest A. "Social Status and Intelligence," *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* 49 (1954) 141-86

Haggstrom, Warren C. "Segregation, Desegregation, and Negro Personality," *Integrated Education,* October-November 1963

_________. *Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962 (University Microfilms Order No. 63-359)

Hall, John Arlis. *The Influence of School Desegregation on the Work Values and Occupational Aspiration Levels of Twelfth-Grade Negro Males in Texas Public High Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order 72-10, 796)

Hall, Morrill M. and Harold W. Gentry. "Isolation of Negro Students in Integrated Public Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* Spring 1969

Hallowell, A. Irving. "Self, Society, and Culture in Phylogenetic Perspective," in Sol Tax (ed.), *Evolution After Darwin,* vol. II: *The Evolution of Man.* Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1960

Hammond, Alpha J., Lucy M. Sawhill, and Robert B. Williams. *A Survey of the Adjustment of the Negro Students Who Transferred to Schools Outside Their Neighborhoods During 1963-1964 Under the New Seattle School Board Rulings.* Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1964

Handler, June M. *An Attempt to Change Kindergarten Children's Attitudes of Prejudice Toward the Negro.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2804

Hanushek, Eric. "The Production of Education, Teacher Quality, and Efficiency," in U.S. Office of Education, *Do Teachers Make a Difference?* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970

Hargrave, Edythe. "How I Feel as a Negro at a White College," *Journal of Negro Education,* October 1942

Harkins, Arthur M., I. Karon Sherarts, and Richard G. Woods. *Public Education of the Prairie Island Sioux: An Interim Report,* December 1969 ERIC ED 040 797

_________, Judith Hammond, I. Karon Sherarts, and Richard G. Woods, *Junior High Indian Children in Minneapolis: A Study of One Public School,* July 1970 ERIC ED 042 214

Harlan, Louis R. *Separate and Unequal Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard States, 1901-1915.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1958

Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. *Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change.* New York: HARYOU, 1946

Harootunian, Berj. *Self-Other Relationships of Segregated and Desegregated Ninth Graders.* February 8, 1968 ERIC ED 023 765

_________ and Richard J. Morse. *Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students Prior to Desegregation. A Study of Negro Student's Freedom of Choice,* September 1968 ERIC ED 024 755

Harris, Albert J. and Robert J. Lovinger. *Some Longitudinal Data on I.Q. Changes in the Intelligence of Negro Adolescents.* New York: City University of New York, 1967

Harris, Gary Reeves. *A Study of the Academic Achievement of Selected Negro and White Fifth-Grade Pupils When Educational Ability is Held Constant.,* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6783)

Harris, N. Dwight. *The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and of the Agitation in That State.* Chicago, Ill.: McClurg, 1904

Harris, Seymour E. *A Statistical Portrait of Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972

Harrison, Bennett. "Ghetto Employment and the Model Cities Program," *Journal of Political Economy,* 82, Part 1 (March-April 1974)

Harrison, Murelle G., Lawrence A. Messe, and Gary E. Stollak. "Effects of Racial Composition and Group Size on Interaction Patterns in Preschool Children," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association,* 6 (1971)

Harwood, Edwin S. *Work and Community Among Urban Newcomers: A Study of the Social and Economic Adaptation of Southern Migrants in Chicago.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago 1966

Haskins, Kenneth W. "A Black Perspective on Community Control," *Inequality in Education,* No. 15 (November 1973)

Hauser, Robert M. and David L. Featherman. "Socioeconomic Achievements of U.S. Men, 1962 to 1972," *Science,* 185 (July 26, 1974)

Hauser, Stuart T. *Black and White Identity Formation. Studies in the Psychosocial Development of Lower Socioeconomic Class Adolescent Boys.* New York: Wiley, 1971

Havassy, Barbara. "A Critical Review of the New Inter-American Series," pp. 57-59 in Bay Area Bilingual League, *Bilingual Testing and Assessment,* 1972. BABEL, 1414 Walnut Street, Room 13, Berkeley, Calif. 94709

Havighurst, Robert J. *Indians and Their Education in Los Angeles,* March 1970 ERIC ED 039 078

——————. *The Indian Self-Image as Evaluated with the Semantic Differential,* August 1970 ERIC ED 044 217

——————. *Mental Development and School Achievement of American Indian Children and Youth,* June 1970 ERIC ED 040 798

——————, Frank L. Smith, and David E. Wilder. *Profile of the Large-City High School.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, November 1970

Hawkes, David Thomas. *An Exploration of the Problems of Teacher Ethnocentricity and Low Expectations in an Urban Integrated School.* Master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1971

Hawkes, Thomas H. and Norma F. Furst. "Race, Socio-Economic Situation, Achievement, I.Q., and Teacher Ratings of Students' Behavior as Factors Relating to Anxiety in Upper Elementary School Children," *Sociology of Education,* 44 (1971)

—————— and ——————. "An Investigation of the (Mis) Conceptions of Pre-and In-Service Teachers as to the Manifestation of Anxiety in Upper Elementary School Children from Different Racial-Socioeconomic Backgrounds," *Psychology in the Schools,* 10 (1973)

Heber, Rick and Howard Garber. "An Experiment in the Prevention of Cultural-Familial Mental Retardation," pp 478-493 in U.S. Congress, *Opportunity, Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement,* below

—————— and others. *Rehabilitation of Families at Risk of Mental Retardation.* Madison, Wisconsin: Rehabilation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, University of Wisconsin, December 1972

Hedgman, Anna Arnold. *The Trumpet Sounds. A Memoir of Negro Leadership.* New York: Holt, 1964

Heiss, Jerold and Susan Owens. "Self-Evaluations of Blacks and Whites," *American Journal of Sociology,* 78 (September 1972)

Heller, Celia S. *Ambitions of Mexican-American Youth, Goals and Means of Mobility of High School Seniors.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1964 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-11, 296)

Helper, Rose. *The Racial Practices of Real Estate Institutions in Selected Areas of Chicago.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958. Published later as *Racial Policies and Practices of Real Estate Brokers.* Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1969

Helton, William Curtis. *Characteristics, Performance, Problems, and Successes of Negro Graduate Students Enrolled in Five Predominantly White State Colleges in Tennessee, 1963-1965.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1966

Henderson, George. "Role Models for Lower Class Negro Boys," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* 46 (1967-68)

Henderson, Norman B., Barbara A. Goffeney, Bruce V. Butler, and Quentin D. Clarkson. "Differential Rates of School Promotion from First Grade for White and Negro, Male and

Female 7-Year Olds," *Psychology in the Schools*, 8 (1971) 101-109

Henderson, Ronald Davis. *A Comparative Analysis of Social-Psychological School Climate Variables in White and Black Elementary Schools With Socio-Economic Status and Achievement Controlled*. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-5398)

Herrick, Mary J. *The Chicago Schools. A Social and Political History*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1971

__________. *Negro Employees of the Chicago Board of Education*. Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1931

Herriott, Robert E. and Nancy H. St. John. *Social Class and the Urban School. The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals*. New York: Wiley, 1966

Herskovits, Melville J. "A Critical Discussion of the 'Mulatto Hypothesis' ", *Journal of Negro Education*, 3 (July 1934) 389-402

Hertzig, Margaret E., Herbert G. Birch, Alexander Thomas and Olga Aran Mendez. *Class and Ethnic Differences in the Responsiveness of Preschool Children to Cognitive Demands*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1968

Heyns, Barbara Lee. *Curriculum Assignment and Tracking Policies in Forty-Eight Urban Public High Schools*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1971

__________and David K. Cohen. *Curriculum Assignment and Tracking Policies in Forty-Eight Urban Public High Schools*, June 1971 ERIC ED 063 451

Hickock, Charles T. *The Negro in Ohio, 1802-1870*. Cleveland, Ohio: Williams Publ. and Electric Co., 1896

Hicks, Leo Baron, Sr. *Apprentice Teaching and Exposure to Additional Information on Methods of Attitude Modification in Negro Students*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-11,864)

Hightower, Jim. *Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times. The Failure of the Land Grant Colloge Complex*. Washington, D.C.: Agribusiness Accountability Project, 1972

Hildebrandt, Charles Au. *The Relationship of Some Personal and Social Variables of School Children to Preference for Mixed Schools*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962. (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2503)

Hill, Leslie Pinckney. "The State Teachers' College in Cheyney and Its Relation to Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education* (October 1932)

Hippler, Arthur Edwin. *Family Structure and Social Structure: Matrifocality in Hunter's Point*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3613)

Hirsch, Jerry. "Behavior-Genetic Analysis and Its Biosocial Consequences," *Seminars in Psychiatry*, 2 (1970) 89-105

Hodgkins, Benjamin J. and Robert G. Stakenas. "A Study of Self-Concepts of Negro and White Youth in Segregated Environments," *Journal of Negro Education*, 38 (1969)

Hoether, James and Gary Siegel. "Three Studies of the Preferences of Students of Different Races for Actors in Interracial Theatre Productions," *Journal of Social Issues*, 26, No. 4 (1970)

Hollister, Clifton D. *Bureaucratic Structure and School-Parent Communication in Eighteen Detroit Elementary Schools*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8277)

Houmes, Gary Alan. *A Study of Racial Disruption in Selected Large-City High Schools as Related to Conflicting Black and White Students' Educational Expectations*. Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-4687)

Houston, Charles H. "Don't Shout Too Soon," *Crisis*, 43 (March 1936)

Howe, Frederick Charles. *Teacher Perceptions Toward the Learning Ability of Students from Differing Racial and Socioeconomic Backgrounds*. Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-11, 872

Howell III, William Lawrence. *The Correlates of Change in School Integration With the Academic Achievement of Eighth Grade Students*. Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-18,153)

Hraba, Joseph. "The Doll Technique: A Measure of Racial Ethnocentrism," *Social Forces*, 50 (1971-1972) 522-527

__________and Geoffrey Grant. "Black is Beautiful: A Reexamination of Racial Preference and

Identification," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16 (1970)

Hsia, Jayjia. *Integration in Evanston, 1967-71: A Longitudinal Evaluation.* Evanston, Ill.: Educational Testing Service, August 1971

Hubert, Kenneth W. *A Study of the Attitudes of Non-Indian Children Toward Indian Children in an Integrated Urban Elementary School.* Master's thesis, University of Calgary, 1969

Hughes, Langston. "Cowards from the College," *Crisis*, 41 (August 1934)

Hulsizer, Allan. *Region and Culture in the Curriculum of the Navaho and the Dakota.* Federalsburg, Md.: J. W. Stowell, 1940

Hunigan, Wendel J. *Is Black Beautiful? A Study of Racial Awareness Among Primary-Age Children.* Master's Thesis, Illinois State University, 1972

Hunt, David E. and Robert H. Hardt. "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Academic Achievement of Negro Students," *Journal of Social Issues*, 25 (1969)

Hunter, Charlayne. "A Homecoming for the First Black Girl at the University of Georgia." *New York Times Magazine*, January 25, 1970

Husen, Torsten. "Multi-National Evaluation of School Systems: Purposes, Methodology, and Some Preliminary Findings," *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 18 (1974) 13-19

Huson, Carolyn F. and Michael E. Schiltz. *College, Color, and Employment. Racial Differences in Postgraduate Employment Among 1964 Graduates of Louisiana Colleges.* Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, July 1966

Indian Voices. The Native American Today. The Second Convocation of American Indian Scholars. San Francisco, Calif. American Indian Educational Publishers, 1974

"Instruction for Non-English Speaking Puerto Rican Pupils in New York City Public School System," Feburary 10, 1971, memorandum for Senator Jacob Javits in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in New York, February 14-15, 1972.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

The Interuniversity Social Research Committee–Chicago Metropolitan Area. *Militancy for and against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967.* Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967

Irvine, S. H. and Sanders, J.T. "Logic, Language, and Method in Construct Identification Across Cultures," in Lee J. Cronbach and P. J. D. Drenth (eds.), *Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation.* The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton 1972

Jackson, Anne Mae. *Differential Characteristics of Reasoning Ability in Negroes and Whites.* Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-2604)

Jackson, Gregg and Cecilia Cosca. "The Inequality of Educational Opportunity in the Southwest: An Observational Study of Ethnically Mixed Classrooms," *American Educational Research Journal*, 11 (Summer 1974)

Jackson, Jacquelyn Johnson, and Viola Elizabeth Jackson. "Needed: Personalized Modes of Learning," *Educational Leadership*, 30 (October 1972)

Jackson, Jonathan and David Kirkpatrick. *A Report: Institute for the Preparation of Counselors and Teacher-Counselors for Effective Service and Leadership in Desegregated Schools,* November, 1967 ERIC ED 020 557

Jacobson, Cardell Klaine. *The Effects of Black Power and the Locus of Control Variable on Performance and Self-Depreciation of Junior High School Students in Biracial Pairs.* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-18,417)

Jacoby, Susan. "Community Control *Can* Work," *Learning*, 2 (December 1973)

James Doyle Hill. *The Effect of Desegregation of the Self-Concept of Negro High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-3391

James, Weldon. "Buildings and Equipment, Too Many Pupils, Too Few Dollars," in Patrick McCauley and Edward D. Ball (eds.), *Southern Schools: Progress and Problems.* Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1959

Janney, Fred, Sharon Malloy, Richard Rossitto, and John Simon. "Conformity as a Function of Race and Age," *Psychological Reports*, 25 (1969)

Jencks, Christopher and others. *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America.* New York: Basic Books, 1972

Jenkins, Herbert Crawford. *The Negro Student at the University of Iowa. A Sociological Study.* Master's thesis, State University of Iowa, 1933

Jensen, Arthur R. "The Differences Are Real," *Psychology Today*, 7 (December 1973)

__________. Do Schools Cheat Minority Children?" *Educational Research* 14 (1971) 3-28

__________. "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" *Harvard Educational Review*, 39 (1969) 1-123

__________. "Kinship Correlations Reported by Sir Cyril Burt," *Behavior Genetics*, 4 (March 1974) 1-28

__________. In Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Jensen (eds.), *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968

__________. "On 'Jensenism': A Reply to Critics," *Education Yearbook, 1973-74.* New York: Macmillan, 1973

__________. "Race Put-Down," *New Society*, February 24, 1972

__________. "Social Class, Race and Genetics: Implications for Education," *American Educational Research* Journal, 5 (1968)

__________. "Statement . . . before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee," *Congressional Record*, July 1, 1970, p. H 6325

__________. "What Jensen Would Say," *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1970

Jensen, Joyce Martin. *School Readiness and Achievement of Crow Indian Children, 1st thru 4th Grades at Pryor, Montana.* Master's thesis, Montana State University, 1970

Jensen, Mary and Lawrence B. Rosenfeld. "Influence of Mode of Presentation, Ethnicity, and Social Class on Teachers' Evaluations of Students," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66 (1974)

Jerrems, Raymond L. *A Sociological-Educational Study of a Public School in a Negro Lower-Class Area of a Big City.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1965

Johnson, Charles S. "The Education of the Negro Child," *Opportunity* (February 1936) 40-41

__________ "Mental Measurements of Negro Groups," *Opportunity*, 1 (February 1923)

__________. *The Negro College Graduate.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1938

Johnson, Douglas F. and Michael, William L. "Performance of Blacks and Whites in Computerized versus Manual Testing Environments," *American Psychologist* (August 1973)

Johnson, Eugene B. *Teacher Influences in the Desegregated Classroom: Factors Mediating the School Desegregation Experience*, Unpublished, 1974

Johnson, Harold T. Harold L. Tyler. *Special Training Institute on Desegregation for Educational Systems of the First District of Georgia*, October 30, 1967 ERIC ED 030 684

Johnson, Norman J., Robert Wyer and Neil Gilbert. "Quality Education and Integration: An Exploratory Study," *Phylon*, Fall 1967

Johnson, Robert Severt. *Comparative Study of Educational Attainment of Warm Springs Indians and Non-Indians in the Madras Union High School for the Years 1956-1965 Inclusive.* Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,749)

Jones, Butler A. *Law and Social Change: A Study of the Impact of New Legal Requirements Affecting Equality of Educational Opportunities for Negroes Upon Certain Customary Official Behavior in the South, 1938-1955.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1955

Jones, James D., Edsel L. Erickson, and Ronald Crowell. "Increasing the Gap Between Whites and Blacks. Tracking as a Contributory Source," *Education and Urban Society*, 4 (May 1972)

Jonsson, Harold A. *Maternal, Teacher and Pupil Attitudes Toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools.* Berkeley: Berkeley Unified District, October 1966

________. *Report of Evaluation of ESEA Title I Compensatory Activities for 1966-67.* Berkeley, Calif.: Berkeley Unified School District, 1967

Jordan, Winthrop D. *White Over Black. American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1968

Jorgensen, Carl Christian. *The Socialization and Meaning of Sense of Internal and External Control Among Black High School Students.*

Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-4909)

Justin, Neal. "Is Busing Helping Students?" *Changing Education,* (Summer 1974)

Kaalberg, Ramona M. *Racial Preferences of Second, Fourth, and Sixth Grade Negro and Caucasian Girls in Hypothetical and Actual Social Situations.* Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-34, 212)

Kagan, Jerome. "The IQ Puzzle: What Are We Measuring?" *Inequality in Education,* No. 14 (July 1973)

__________. "The Poor Are Educable," *New York Times,* January 16, 1974

Kamin, Leon J. *Heredity, Intelligence, Politics, and Psychology,* 1973, unpublished

__________. "Text of Dr. Kamin's Presentation Denying That Proof Exists That IQ Test Scores Are Hereditary," *South Today* 4 (May-June 1973) 1-5

Kaplan, Henry K. and Anthony J. Matkom. "Peer Status and Intellectual Functioning of Negro School Children," *Psychology in the Schools,* April 1967

Kaplan, John. "Segregation Litigation and the Schools - Part III: The Gary Litigation," *Northwestern University Law Review,* (May-June 1964)

Kariger, Roger Hugh. *The Relationship of Lane Grouping to the Socioeconomic Status of the Parents of Seventh Grade Pupils in Three Junior High Schools.* Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962 (University Microfilms Order No. 63-3723)

Katz, Irwin, Calvin O. Atchison, Edgar G. Epps, and S. Oliver Roberts. "Race of Evaluator, Race of Norm, and Expectancy as Determinants of Black Performance," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 8 (1972)

Katz, Phyllis A. "Perception of Racial Cues in Preschool Children: A New Look," *Developmental Psychology* 8 (1973) 295-299

__________. "Stimulus Predifferentiation and Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes," *Child Development,* 44 (1973) 232-237

__________ and Carol Seavey. "Labels and Children's Perceptions of Faces," *Child Development,* 44 (1973) 770-775

Katzenmeyer, William G. *Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1962 (University Microfilms Order No. 63-2227)

Katzman, Martin T. *The Political Economy of Urban Schools.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1971

Kee, Daniel W. "Learning Efficiency in Four Ethnic Groups," *Integrated Education,* 10 (November-December 1972)

__________ and William D. Rohwer, Jr. "Noun-Pair Learning in Four Ethnic Groups," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 65 (1973)

Keller, Suzanne and Marisa Zavilloni. "Ambition and Social Class: A Respecification," *Social Forces,* October 1964

Kelley, Joan Marie. *School Segregation-Desegregation Preferences.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-794)

Kelley, Thomas James. *White Press/Black Man. An Analysis of the Editorial Opinion of the Four Chicago Daily Newspapers Toward the Race Problem: 1954-1968.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971.

Kennedy, Wallace A. *A Follow-Up Normative Study of Negro Intelligence and Achievement.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969

__________, Vernon DeRiet, and James C. White. *The Standardization of the 1960 Revision of the Standard-Binet Intelligence Scale on Negro Elementary-School Children in the Southeastern United States.* Tallahassee, Fla.: Human Development Clinic, Florida State University, 1961

Keough, Barbara K. and Donald L. Macmillan. "Effects of Motivational and Presentation Conditions on Digit Recall of Children of Differing Socioeconomic, Racial and Intelligence Groups," *American Educational Research Journal,* 8 (January 1971)

Kevles, Daniel J. "Testing the Army's Intelligence: Psychologists and the Military in World War II," *Journal of American History,* 55 (1968) 565-81

Kidd, J. Roby. "Education of the Canadian Indian and Eskimo," *Integrated Education,* December 1966 - January 1967

Killian, L. R. *Cognitive Test Performance of Spanish-American Primary-School Children: A Longitudinal Study,* November 1971 ERIC ED 060 156

Kimball, William L. *Parent and Family Influences on Academic Achievement Among Mexican-American Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-16,550)

King, Kenneth Douglas. *Attitudes on School Decentralization in New York's Three Experimental School Districts.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-4170)

King, Martin Luther. "Let Justice Roll Down," *Nation,* March 15, 1965, 271-272

Kinnick, Bernard C. and Stanton D. Platter. "Attitudinal Change Toward Negroes and School Desegregation Among Participants in a Summer Training Institute," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 73 (1967)

Kircher, Mary and Lita Furby. "Racial Preferences in Young Children," *Child Development,* 42 (1971)

Kleck, Robert E. *The Role of Stigma as a Factor in Social Interaction.* Bethesda, Md.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1968

Klein, Arthur J. (ed.) *Survey of Negro Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1929

Klein, Robert Stanley. *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement of Negro 10th Grade High School Students Attending Segregated and Recently Integrated Schools in a Metropolitan Area of the South.* Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,565)

Klein, Rosalyn Shapiro. *Some Factors Influencing Empathy in Six-and Seven-Year Old Children Varying in Ethnic Background.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-3862)

Kleinfeld, Judith S. *Cognitive Strengths of Eskimos and Implications for Education,* November 1970 ERIC ED 045 281

———. "Intellectual Strengths in Culturally Different Groups: An Eskimo Illustration," *Review of Educational Research,* 43 (Summer 1973)

———. "Sense of Fate Control and Community Control of the Schools," *Education and Urban Society,* 3 (May 1971)

Klineberg, Otto. "Cultural Factors in Intelligence-Test Performance," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3 (July 1934) 478-483

———. *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1935

Klingberg, Frank J. *The Appraisal of the Negro in Colonial South Carolina. A Study in Americanization.* Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1941

Knight, Margaret E. *The Nature of Teacher-Community Contact in Schools Serving Southwest Indian Children.* March 1970 ERIC ED 052 880

Koponen, Niilo E. "The Myth of a 'Tipping Point' ", *Integrated Education,* 4 (August-September 1966)

Koslin, Sandra Cohen, Marianne Amarel and Nancy Ames. "A Distance Measure of Racial Attitudes in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Psychology in the Schools,* October 1969

———, and . "The Effect of Race on Peer Evaluation and Preference in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (Fall 1970)

———, Bertram L. Koslin, Richard Pargament, and Harvey Waxman. "Classroom Racial Balance and Students' Interracial Attitudes," *Sociology of Education,* 45 (February 1972) 386-407

———, ——— Richard Pargament and Harvey Waxman. "Effects of School Balance on Racial Attitudes," no date.

———, ——— John Cardwell, and Richard Pargament. "A Quasidisguised and Structured Measure of School-children's Racial Preferences." Paper delivered at annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., September 1969

Kraus, Philip E. *Yesterday's Children. A Longitudinal Study of Children from Kindergarten Into the Adult Years.* New York: Wiley, 1973

Krenkel, Noele. *Self-Concept and Interaction Patterns of Children in a Desegregated School.* Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco, 1972

Krystall, Eric R., Mark A. Chesler, and Agatha E. White. *Voting Behavior and Attitudes Toward School Desegregation: A Study of Southern*

Negroes. Tuskegee, Ala.: Department of Social Science Research, Tuskegee Institute, March 1967

________, Neil Friedman, Glenn Howze, and Edgar G. Epps. "Attitudes Toward Integration and Black Consciousness: Southern Negro High School Seniors and Their Mothers," *Phylon,* 31 (Summer 1970), p. 113

Kuhn, Kenneth Chester. *Self-Concept of Black and White Students Between and Among Social Classes in Newly Desegregated Elementary Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-7738)

Kurtz, Harold. "Court Mandated Integration and White Flight in Los Angeles County," p. 1426 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd Session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing. Hearings* . . . Part 3, Serial No. 32. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972

________. "An Independent Assessment of 'Integration in Evanston, 1967-1971: A Longitudinal Evaluation: A Report on the Educational Consequences of Desegregation in District 65 of Evanston, Illinois," pp. 1436-1443 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing. Hearings* . . . Part 3. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972

Ladner, Joyce Ann. *On Becoming a Woman in the Ghetto: Modes of Alienation.* Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 190)

Laing, Donald S. *Other Aspects of Buffalo's Program of Quality Integrated Education.* Buffalo, N.Y.: Board of Education, February 21, 1971

Laishley, Jennie. "Some Perspectives on Race and Intelligence," *New Community,* 2 (Spring 1973)

Lammers, Donald Milton. *Self-Concepts of American Adolescents Having Segregated and Desegregated Elementary Backgrounds.* Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-14,723)

Landers, Jacob. *Higher Horizons Progress Report.* New York: Board of Education, 1963

________. "A Letter to the Editor," *Integrated Education,* (February-March 1967) 48-49

________. "Profiles of Inequality in New York City," *Integrated Education,* 11 (January-February 1973), 3-14

________, Testimony at Public Hearing on "Education in New York City for Low Income Youngsters," November 16, 1967

Landry, Lawrence. "The Chicago School Boycott," *New University Thought* (December, 1963-January, 1964)

Larsen, Mary Juhan and Jerry C. Allen. "Effects of Certain Subject Variables on Stanford-Binet Item Performance of Five-Year-Old Children," *Psychological Reports,* 26 (1960)

Laurent, James Arthur. *Do Pupil Race and/or School Racial Balance Affect Academic Performance?* December 1970 ERIC ED 048 393

________. *Effects of Race and Racial Balance of School on Academic Performance.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-9449)

Lawton, Stephen B. "Minority Administrators in Berkeley. A Progress Report," *Urban Education,* 6 (January 1972) 321-30

Layden, Russell Glenn. *The Relationship Between the Language of Instruction and the Development of Self-Concept, Classroom Climate and Achievement of Spanish Speaking Puerto Rican Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-9704)

Layzer, David. "Heritability Analyses of I.Q. Scores: Science or Numerology?" *Science,* 183 (March 29, 1974) 1259-1266. (For discussion, see *Science,* 118 (June 13, 1975) 1125-1130.)

Lee, Frank F. *Negro and White in Connecticut Town.* New York: Booman, 1961

Lee, William Vernon. "Each Year I Am Learning Less and Less," *Integrated Education,* 12 (January-April 1974)

Leifer, Anna. *Ethnic Patterns in Cognitive Tasks.* Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-23,578)

________. "Ethnic Patterns in Cognitive Tasks," *Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association,* 7 (1972)

________. "Mosaics of Disadvantaged Negro and White Preschoolers Compared," *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 121 (1972) 59-63

Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence. *Six-City Study. A Survey of Racial Attitudes in Six Northern Cities: Preliminary Findings.*

Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, June 1967

Lesser, Gerald S., Gordon Fifer, and Donald H. Clark. *Mental Abilities of Children from Different Social-Class and Cultural Groups.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965

———, Kristine M. Rosenthal, Sally E. Polkoff, and Marjorie B. Pfankuch. "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," *Integrated Education,* (June-July 1964)

Lessing, Elsie E. "Racial Differences in Indices of Ego Functioning Relevant to Academic Achievement," *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 115 (1969) 161-162

Levine, Daniel U. and Norman S. Fiddmont. "Integration Is Up to Date in Kansas City," *Integrated Education,* 7 (1969) 3-16

Levine, Naomi and Richard Cohn. *Ocean Hill-Brownsville: Schools in Crisis. A Case History.* New York: Popular Library, 1969

Levy, Marilyn. "Project Concern in Cheshire. A Preliminary Report." Cheshire, Conn.: Department of Education, January, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Oportunity Hearings. . .,* Part 1B - *Equality of Educational Opportunity, Appendix.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970, pp. 590-598

Lewis, Bernard. *Race and Color in Islam.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1971

Lewontin, Richard C. "Hermstein's Sleight-of-Hand," *Harvard Crimson,* December 11, 1973

——— "Race and Intelligence," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* 26 (March 1970), pp. 2-8 and "Further Remarks on Race and the Genetics of Intelligence," *ibid.*, 26 (May 1970), pp. 23-25

Linton, Thomas H. *A Study of the Relationship of Global Self-Concept, Academic Self-Concept, and Academic Achievement Among Anglo and Mexican-American Sixth-Grade Students,* April 1972 ERIC ED 063 053

Lipton, Aaron. "Classroom Grouping and Integration," *Integrated Education,* 2 (February-March 1964) 49-54

———. "Day-to-Day Problems of School Integration," *Integrated Education,* 3 (June-July 1965)

Liu, Annabel. "The Problems Blacks Meet at Iowa State," *Des Moines Register,* May 5, 1974

Lockhart, Lillie Marie. *An Analysis of Variables Which Tend to be Associated With Race Related Acts of Violence at Specific Schools in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania from 1967 to 1970.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-4113)

Lockwood, Jane D. *An Examination of Scholastic Achievement, Attitudes and Home Background Factors of Sixth-Grade Negro Students in Balanced and Unbalanced Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-8303)

Loeb, Jacques. "Science and Race," *Crisis,* 9 (December 1914)

Logan, Rayford W. "Educational Segregation in the North," *Journal of Negro Education,* (January 1933)

Lombardi, Donald N. "Factors Affecting Change in Attitude Toward Negroes Among High School Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Spring 1965

Long, Barbara H. and Edmund H. Henderson. *The Effect of Pupils' Race, Class, Test Scores and Classroom Behavior on the Academic Expectancies of Southern and Southern and Non-Southern White Teachers,* April 1972 ERIC ED 063 422

——— and ——— "Self-Social Concepts of Disadvantaged School Beginners," Unpublished paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, September 1966

Long, David. *Educational Performance in Integrated and Segregated Elementary Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-10, 982)

Long, Howard L. "The Intelligence of Colored Elementary Pupils in Washington, D.C." *Journal of Negro Education,* 3 (July 1934)

———. "Some Psychogenic Hazards of Segregated Education of Negroes," *Journal of Negro Education,* 4 (1935)

——— "Test Results of Third-Grade Negro Children Selected on the Basis of Socioeconomic Status," 1, *Journal of Negro Education,* 4 (1935)

Lopez, Josephine. "Free Compulsory Public Education: The 'Great Equalizer' or the Great Divider?" *Edcentric,* October-November 1972

Lopez, Richard Emilio. *An Investigation of the Interrelationship Between Skin Color, Skin Color Preference, and Acculturation-Assimilation Among Chicano College Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Davis, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-8334)

Lorenz, Gerda. "Aspirations of Low-Income Blacks and Whites: A Case of Reference Group Processes," *American Journal of Sociology*, 78 (September 1972)

Lucas, Isidro. "Puertorriquenos En Chicago: El Problema Educativo Del Dropout," *Rican* 1 (May 1974) 5-18

Ludmerer, Kenneth M. *Genetics and American Society. A Historical Appraisal.* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972

Lugo, James Oscar. *A Comparison of Degrees of Bilingualism and Measure of School Achievement Among Mexican-American Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-7724)

Lutterbie, Patricia H. *Black Administrator: Winners and Losers in the Desegregation-Integration Process.* April 1974 ERIC ED 090 657

McClearn, Gerald E. "The Inheritance of Behavior," in Postman, *Psychology in the Making,* below

Mackler, Bernard. "Blacks Who Are Academically Successful," *Urban Education,* 5 (October 1970)

———. "Grouping in the Ghetto," *Education and Urban Society,* 2 (1969)

———. "Up From Proverty: The Price of 'Making It' In a Ghetto School," in A. Harry Passow (ed.), *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1972

MacMillan, Robert Wilson. *A Study of the Effect of Socioeconomic Factors on the School Achievement of Spanish Speaking School Beginners.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-3327)

Maddox, James G. with E. E. Liebhafsky, Vivian W. Henderson, and Herbert M. Hamlin. *The Advancing South. Manpower Prospects and Problems.* New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1967

Mahan, Aline Mattson. *Social Factors and the Academic Success of Urban Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-1286)

———and Thomas W. Mahan. "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools in Inner City Children," *Integrated Education,* 8 (January-February 1970)

Maliver, Bruce L. *Anti-Negro Bias Among Negro College Students.* Doctoral dissertation, Yeshiva University, 1964 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-10,006)

Malry, Leton. *The Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Anglo, Spanish, and Negro High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8284)

Mann, Dale. "Political Representation and Urban School Advisory Council," *Teachers College Record,* 75 (February 1974)

Manning, Jean Bell. *The Influence of a Short-Term Program to Improve the Self-Concept of Selected Negro Children.* Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-561)

Marascuilo, Leonard A. *Follow-Up Study of Student Attitude Toward School Reorganization of the Public Schools of a Northern City,* January, 1972 ERIC ED 069 843

———and F. Dagenais. *Identification of Social Groups Based on Social Integration in a Multi-Racial High School,* 1974, Unpublished

———and Joel R. Levin. "Inter- and Intraracial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February, 1966 annual meeting of the American Education Research Association

Marcum, Roger Brasel. *An Exploration of the First-Year Effects of Racial Integration of the Elementary Schools in a Unit School District.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-10,784)

Margolis, Richard J. *The Losers. A Report on the Puerto Ricans and the Public Schools.* New York: Aspira, Inc., May 1968

Marjoribanks, Kevin. "Ethnic and Environmental Influences on Mental Abilities," *American Journal of Sociology,* 78 (September 1972)

Markley, Oliver Wendell. *Having a Negro Roommate As An Experience in Intercultural Education.* Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1890)

Martin, Harold P. "Nutrition: Its Relationship to Children's Physical, Mental, and Emotional Development," *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 26 (July 1973)

Martinez-Monfort, Antonio. *Racial Attitudes of High School Students Attending Desegregated Schools in a Southern Metropolitan Area.* Doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-3424)

Marx, Gary. *Protest and Prejudice. A Study of Belief in the Black Community.* New York: Harper & Row, 1967

Marx, Ronald W. and Philip H. Winne. "Self-Concept and Achievement: Implications for Educational Programs," *Integrated Education*, 13 (January-February 1975) 30-31

Matthews, Robert L. *Black Studies, Academic Achievement and the Self-Concept of Selected Tenth Graders.* Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-25,397)

Matzen, Stanley P. *The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518)

Mayer, Robert R., Charles E. King, Anne Borders-Patterson, and James S. McCullough. *The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. A Case Study in the Analysis of Educational Policy.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974

Mayeske, George W., Carl E. Wisler, Albert E. Beaton, Jr., Frederic D. Weinfeld, Wallace M. Cohen, Tetsuo Okada, John M. Proshek, and Kenneth A. Tabler. *A Study of Our Nation's Schools.* A Working Paper. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (1970)

__________, Tetsuo Okada, Wallace M. Cohen, Albert E. Beaton, Jr. and Carl E. Wisler. *A Study of the Achievement of Our Nation's Students.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

Mayo, Marion Jacob. "The Mental Capacity of the American Negro," reprinted from the *Archives of Psychology*, No. 28, (November 1913)

McAdoo, Harriette Ann Pipes. *Racial Attitudes and Self Concepts of Black Preschool Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-4677)

McAdoo, John Lewis. *An Exploratory Study of Racial Attitude Change in Black Preschool Children Using Differential Treatments.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-4679)

McAllister, Jane Ellen. "Childhood As I Remember It," *Integrated Education*, 11 (July-October 1973)

McArdle, Clare G. and Nancy F. Young. "Classroom Discussion of Racial Identity or How Can We Make It Without 'Acting White'?" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 40 (1970)

McCoy, Jr., Rhody Arnold. *Analysis of Critical Issues and Incidents in the New York City School Crisis 1967-1970 and Their Implication for Urban Education in the 1970's.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-25,304)

McCullough, Sr., Leonard James. *A Study of the Predictive Efficiency of the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity, Level 2, For Negro and White Subjects.* Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-19,814)

McDill, Edward L., Mary S. McDill, and J. Timothy Sprehe. *Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education: An Appraisal of Evaluation Research.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970

__________, Leo C. Rigsby, and Edmund D. Meyers, Jr. *Educational Climates of High Schools: Their Effects and Sources,* April 1969 ERIC ED 030 205

McDonald, Marjorie. *Not by the Color of Their Skin, The Impact of Racial Differences on the Child's Development.* New York: International Universities Press, 1970

McDowell, Sophia Fagin. *The Willingness of Negro Youths to Associate with Whites.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967

McMillan, Joseph Howard. *The Influence of Caucasian Teachers on Negro and Caucasian Students in Segregated and Racially Mixed Inner-City Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-4189)

McPartland, James *The Relative Influence of School Desegregation and of Classroom Desegregation on the Academic Achievement of*

Ninth Grade Negro Students. Interim Report. Baltimore: Md.; Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, September 1967

McWhirt, Ronald Alfred. *The Effects of Desegregation on Prejudice, Academic Aspiration and the Self-Concept of Tenth Grade Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15, 568)

Meeks, Donald E. *Race, Social Class, and Level of Aspiration: The Effects of Race and Social on the Goal-Striving Behavior of White and Negro Boys.* Doctoral dissertation, Smith College, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-907)

Meier, August and Elliott Rudwick. *CORE. A Study in the Civil Rights Movement 1942-1968.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1973

——— and ———. "Negro Boycotts of Jim Crow Schools in the North, 1897-1925," *Integrated Education,* 5 (August-September 1967)

Meketon, Betty F. *The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966

Meltzer, Bert. *The Influence of the Duration of Interracial Classroom Contact on the Development of Interpersonal Cognitive Skills.* Doctoral dissertation, Clark University, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-11,183)

Meltzer, Carole Gammer. *The Effects of Age, Race of Victim, and Ability to Take Another's Role in Helpfulness and Sharing in Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-8,313)

Mercer, Jane R. "Issues and Dilemmas in School Desegregation: A Case Study," *Western Regional Conference on Testing Problems Proceedings, 1968*

———. *Labeling the Mentally Retarded, Clinical and Social System Perspectives on Mental Retardation.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1973

———. "A Policy Statement on Assessment Procedures and the Rights of Children," *Harvard Educational Review,* 44 (February 1974)

Meyer, Philip. "Busing: A Free Press Survey of a Primary Issue: How Blacks and Whites See It—and Why," *Detroit Free Press,* May 7, 1972

Meyers, Edmund Dean, Jr. *Effects of Social and Educational Climate of High Schools Upon the Academic Performance of Negro and White Adolescents.* Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-13,817)

Meyers, Edna O. *Self-Concept, Family Structure and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5540)

———. "Self-Concept, Family Structure, and School Achievement: A Study of Disadvantaged Negro Boys," (abstract) New York: Northside Center for Child Development, n.d.

Mezz, Sheila Mayers. *Effects of a "Black Cultural Positives" Program on the Self-Concepts and Attitudes of Black Junior High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-29,400)

Miller, Gordon W. "Factors in School Achievement and Social Class," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 61 (1970)

Miller, Harold J. *The Effects of Integration on Rural Indian Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-8560)

Miller, Harry L. "The Relation of Social Class to Slum School Attitudes Among Education Students in an Urban College," *Journal of Teacher Education,* 19 (1968) 416-424

Miller, Kent S. and Ralph M. Dreger (eds.) *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States.* New York: Seminar Press, 1973

Miller, LaMar P. and Edmund W. Gordon (eds.) *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* N.Y.: AMS Press, 1974

Miller, Max Donald. *Patterns of Relations of Fluid and Crystallized Mental Abilities to Achievement in Different Ethnic Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-9117)

Miller, Norman. "Riverside School Study: Summary and Conclusion" Unpublished, 1974

Milner, Jr., Murray. "Race Education, and Jobs: Trends, 1960-1970," *Sociology of Education,* 46 (1973)

Mitra, Shib K. "Mirror, Mirror . . . A Brief Note on American Educational Research," *American*

Educational Research Journal, 11 (Winter 1974) 41-49

Mock, Ronald Lester. *The Relationship Among Children Between Conformity and the Racial Composition of Small Quasi-Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-3658)

Moody, Charles David, Sr. *Black Superintendents in Public School Districts: Trends and Conditions.* Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-30,897)

Moore, Louise. *The Relationship of Selected Pupil and School Variables and the Reading Achievement of Third-Year Primary Pupils in a Desegregated School Setting.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-11,018)

Moore, William, Jr. *A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-School Child.* Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-13,475)

Moorfield, Thomas Earl. *The Busing of Minority Group Children in a Big City School System.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1967

Moorehead, Mona Faye. *The Effects of School Integration on Intelligence Test Scores of Negro Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-20,270)

Moreno, Marguerite Cusack. *The Effect of Integration on the Aptitude, Achievement, Attitudes to School and Class and Social Acceptance of Negro and White Pupils in a Small Urban School System.* Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-27,014)

Moreno, Steve. "Problems Related to Present Testing Instruments," *El Grito,* 3 (Spring 1970)

Morgan, James N. and others. *Five Thousand American Families - Patterns of Economic Progress.* Vol. I: *An Analysis of the First Five Years of the Panel Study of Income Dynamics.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1974.

Morland, J. Kenneth. "A Comparison of Race Awareness in Northern and Southern Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* January 1966

________. "The Development of Racial Bias in Young Children," *Thecry into Practice,* 2 (1963)

________. "Race Awareness Among American and Hong Kong Chinese Children," *American Journal of Sociology,* 75 (1969)

________. "Racial Acceptance and Preference of Nursery School Children in a Southern City," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* 8 (1962)

________. "Racial Recognition in Nursery School Children in Lynchburg, Virginia," *Social Forces,* December 1958

________. "Racial Self-Identification: A Study of Nursery School Children," *American Catholic Sociological Review,* Fall 1963

Morris, Jr., Charles F. *Problems Encountered in the Desegregation of Carver Junior High School - 1970-1971.* Master's thesis, Wake Forest University, 1971

Morris, Joseph. *Personal Adjustment of the High Achieving Negro Student.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-12,192)

Morris, Willie. *Yazoo, Integration in a Deep South Town.* New York: Harper and Row, 1971

Morrison, J. Cayce. *The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957. A Report on the Education and Adjustment of Puerto Rican Pupils in the Public Schools of the City of New York.* New York: Board of Education, 1958

Mosher, Fritz. "Harvard-IEA Conference: A Harvard View," *Harvard Graduate School of Education Alumni Bulletin,* 18 (Spring-Summer 1974)

Moynihan, Daniel P. and Mosteller, F. *On Equality of Educational Opportunity.* New York: Random House, 1972

Muir, Donald E. "The First Years of Desegregation: Patterns of Acceptance of Black Students on a Deep-South Campus, 1963-69," *Social Forces,* 40 (March 1971) 371-378

________. "Six-Year Trends in Integration Attitudes of Deep-South University Students," *Integrated Education,* 9 (January-February 1971) 21-27

________ and C. Donald McGlamery. "The Evolution of Desegregation Attitudes of Southern University Students," *Phylon,* 29 (1968) 105-117

Muller, H. J. "Mental Traits and Heredity," *Journal of Heredity,* 16 (December 1925)

Munford, Luther. *Black Gravity: Resegregation in 30 Mississippi School Districts.* Senior thesis, Princeton University, April 16, 1971

__________. "White Flight from Desegregation in Mississippi," *Integrated Education,* 11 (May-June 1973)

Muse, Benjamin. *Ten Years of Prelude. The Story of Integration Since the Supreme Court's 1954 Decision.* New York: Viking, 1964

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund with the cooperation of the Center for Law and Education, Harvard University. *An Even Chance.* N.Y.: NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1971

Nam, Charles B., A. Lewis Rhodes, and Robert E. Herriott. *Inequalities in Educational Opportunities. A Demographic Analysis of Education Differences in the Population.* Tallahassee, Fla.; Florida State University May, 1966

National Advisory Committee on Education. *Federal Relations to Education, Part I, Committee Findings and Recommendations.* Washington, D.C.: National Capitol Press, 1931

National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, Detroit, Michigan. *A Study of Barriers to Equal Educational Opportunity in a Large City.* Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, March 1967

NEA Task Force on School Desegregation in Louisiana. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, February 15-22, 1970

Negron de Montilla, Aida. *Americanization in Puerto Rico and the Public School System 1900-1930.* Rio Piedras, P.R.: Editorial Edil, 1971

Nelsen, Edward A. and Norman P. Uhl. "The Social Environments of Segregated and Desegregated Schools," *Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology,* 3 (Summer 1973)

Nelson, Bryce. "Indians Lose Case for Sovereignty," *Los Angeles Times,* January 18, 1975

New Jersey State Temporary Commission on the Condition of the Urban Colored Population. *Report . . . to the Legislature of the State of New Jersey . . . 1939.* Trenton N.J.: The Legislature, 1939

Newton, Huey P. with the assistance of J. Herman Blake. *Revolutionary Suicide.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973

Nichols, Paul L. and V. Elving Anderson. "Intellectual Performance, Race, and Socioeconomic Status," *Social Biology,* 20 (December 1973) 367-374

Nieves Falcon, Luis. *Recruitment to Higher Education in Puerto Rico, 1940-1960.* Rio Piedras, P. R.: Editorial Universitaria Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1965

Noel, Donald L. "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," Unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association

North, George E., and O. Lee Buchanan. "Teacher Views of Poverty Area Children," *Journal of Educational Research,* October 1967

Norton, Dolores G. *Environment and Cognitive Development: A Comparative Study of Socioeconomic Status and Race.* Doctoral dissertation, Bryn Mawr College, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-11, 187)

Nowak, William Stanley. *The Effect of School Busing on Black Student Attitude Toward School.* Master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1970

Noyola, Arnaldo Jaime. *Psychosocial and Academic Factors Associated with Elementary School Dropouts in the Barrios of San Antonio.* Master's thesis, University of Texas, 1972

Oak, V. V. and Eleanor O. Oak. "The Illegal Status of Separate Education in New Jersey," *School and Society* (May 21, 1938)

Oakland, Thomas and Edmund Emmer. *Effects of Knowledge of Criterion Groups on the Test Performance of Negro and Mexican American Students,* 1972 ERIC ED 064 379

Ochberg, Frank M. and Edison Tridsett. "Administrative Responses to Racial Conflict in a High School," *Community Mental Health Journal,* 6 (1970)

O'Connor, Andrew Lewis, III. *The Relationship of Imitation to Intelligence and Scholastic Achievement of Negro and White First Grade Pupils in Integrated Classes.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-13,023

Odell, William R. *Educational Survey Report for the Philadelphia Board of Public Education.* Philadelphia: Board of Public Education, February 1, 1965

Offenbacher, Deborah I. *Cultures in Conflict. Home and School as Seen Through the Eyes of Lower-Class Students.* (January 1969)

Office for Civil Rights. "Much Better Than They Expected," *Integrated Education,* 8 (1970)

Ogbu, John U. *The Next Generation. An Ethnography of Education in an Urban Neighborhood.* New York: Academic Press, 1974

Ohberg, Hjordis G. "Does the Black Child Need a Black Teacher?" *Integrated Education,* (March-April 1972)

Olds, Morris Eugene. *Teachers' Reactions to Faculty Desegregation.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-362)

O'Leary, Malcolm. *Accreditation of Negro Colleges and Secondary Schools by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.* Master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1965

O'Neill, Elizabeth Ford Stone. *Mexican American Children in the Process of Acculturation.* Master's thesis, University of the Pacific, 1968

Ono, Shin Ya and Vickie Gabriner. " 'Community Control' at Two Bridges: What Went Wrong?" *Leviathan,* June 1969

Orfield, Gary. *The Reconstruction of Southern Education. The Schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.* New York: Wiley, 1969

Ortega, Frank. "Special Education Placement and Mexican Americans," *El Grito,* 4 (Summer 1971)

Ortiz, Alfonso. "Native Education Under Fire," *Indian Historian,* 2 (Summer 1969)

Osuna, Juan Jose. *A History of Education in Puerto Rico.* 2nd ed. Rio Piedras, P.R.: Editorial de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, 1949

Owen, John D. *Racial Bias in the Allocation of Teachers in Sixty-Nine Urban Elementary School Systems,* November 1969 ERIC ED 034 838

Page, Ellis B. "Miracle in Milwaukee: Raising the IQ," *Educational Researcher,* 1 (October 1972)

Palmer, Francis H. "Socioeconomic Status and Intellective Performance among Negro Preschool Boys," *Developmental Psychology,* 3 (1970) 1-9

Palmer, James M. *Mississippi School Districts. Factors in the Disestablishment of Dual Systems.* State College, Mississippi: Social Science Research Center, Mississippi State University, August 1971

Palomares, Geraldine Dunn. *The Effects of Stereotyping on the Self-Concept of Mexican Americans,* 1970 ERIC ED 056 806

Pancoast, Elinor. *The Report of a Study on Desegregation in the Baltimore City Schools.* Baltimore: Maryland Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations, 1956

Panetta, Leon E. and Peter Gall. *Bring Us Together. The Nixon Team and the Civil Rights Retreat.* Philadelphia, Pa.: Lippincott, 1971

Parker, Marjorie Holloman. *The Educational Activities of the Freedmen's Bureau.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1951

Parsons, Jr., Theodore W. *Ethnic Cleavage in a California School.* Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2602)

Passow, A. Harry. *Toward Creating a Model Urban School System: A Study of the Washington, D.C. Public Schools.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967

Patchen, Martin and James D. Davison with Gerhard Hofmann and William R. Brown. *Patterns and Determinants of Inter-Racial Interaction in the Indianapolis Public High Schools.* West Lafayette, Indiana: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, July, 1973

Payne, Joseph F. "Race, Reading, and Poverty in Los Angeles," *Integrated Education,* 9 (November-December 1971)

Payne, William. "The Negro Land-Grant Colleges," *Civil Rights Digest, 3 (Spring 1970)*

Pecoraro, Joseph. *The Effects of a Series of Special Lessons on Indian History and Culture Upon the Attitudes of Indian and Non-Indian Students.* August 1970 ERIC ED 043 556

Peltason, Jack W. *Fifty-Eight Lonely Men. Southern Federal Judges and School Desegregation.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961

Peterson, Joseph. "Basic Consideration of Methodology in Race Testing," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3 (July 1934)

Pettigrew, Thomas F. *The Consequences of Racial Isolation in the Public Schools: Another Look,* unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967

__________. *A Study of School Integration.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1970

__________, Marshall Smith, Elizabeth L. Useem and Clarence Normand. "Busing: A Review of 'The Evidence'," *Public Interest,* No. 30 (Winter 1973)

Pettit, George A. *Primitive Education in North America.* Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1946

Phillips, W. M., Jr., and others. *Participation of the Black Community in Selected Aspects of the Educational Institution of Newark, 1958-1972,* July 1973 ERIC ED 091 492

Pitts, James P. "Group Disorders in the Public Schools: A Comment," *American Sociological Review,* 39 (February 1974)

Platoff, Joan C. *The Effect of Education and Race on the Language and Attitudes Verbally Expressed by Mothers of Preschool Children.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-6165)

Porter, Judith D. R. *Black Child, White Child. The Development of Racial Attitudes.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971

Posner, Carmen A. *Some Effects of Genetic and Cultural Variables on Self-Evaluations of Children.* Doctoral Dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-9835

Postman, Leo (ed.) *Psychology in the Making. Histories of Selected Research Problems.* New York: Knopf, 1962

Poussaint, Alvin F. "Building a Strong Self-Image in the Black Child," *Ebony,* 29 (August 1974)

Powell, Alice Mendham. *Racial Awareness and Social Behavior in an Interracial Four-Year-Old Group.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Maryland, 1958

Powell, Christus N. *Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama.* Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5382)

Powell, Gloria Johnson. "Self-Concept in White and Black Children," in Charles V. Willie, Bernard M. Kramer and Bertram S. Brown (eds.), *Racism and Mental Health. Essays.* Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973

__________with Marielle Fuller. *Black Monday's Children: A Study of the Effects of School Desegregation on Self-Concepts of Southern Children.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973

Powers, Jerry M., *et al.* "A Research Note on the Self-Perception of Youth," *American Educational Research Journal,* 8 (March 1971)

President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty. *The People Left Behind.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September 1967

Preston, James D. and Jerry W. Robinson, Jr. "On Modification of Interracial Interaction," *American Sociological Review,* 39 (April 1974) See, also, rejoinder by Cohen and Roper

Price, J. St. Clair. "Negro-White Differences in General Intelligence," *Journal of Negro Education* 3 (July 1934)

Prichard, Paul N. "Effects of Desegregation on Student Success in the Chapel Hill City Schools," *Integrated Education,* 7 (1969) 33-37

Public Affairs Research Council of Louisiana. *Improving Quality During School Desegregation,* February, 1969 ERIC ED 029 363

Pugh, Roderick W. "A Comparative Study of the Adjustment of Negro Students in Mixed and Separate High Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* 12 (1943)

Purdy, Joseph Donald. *Associative Learning Rates of Second, Fourth, and Sixth-Grade Indian and White Children Using a Paired-Associate Learning Task.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17,486)

Purl, Mabel C. *Progress Report.* Riverside, Calif.: Riverside School Study, October 15, 1968

__________with Adrian E. Lindell. *The Relationship of SES to Higher Achieving Minority Pupils.* Riverside, Calif.: Riverside Unified School District, July, 1974

Quarles, Benjamin. *Black Abolitionists.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1969

Radin, Norma. *A Comparison of the Test Performance of Negro Students Attending All-Negro and Integrated Elementary Schools in One Community.* Ypsilanti, Mich. Public Schools, April 15, 1966, unpublished.

Radke, Marion, Jean Sutherland, and Pearl Rosenberg. "Racial Attitudes of Children," *Sociometry,* 13 (1950)

__________, Helen G. Trager, and Hadassah Davis. "Social Perceptions and Attitudes of Children," *Genetic Psychology Monographs,* 40 (1949)

__________ and __________, "Children's Perceptions of the Social Roles of Negroes and Whites," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 29 (1950)

Raffel, Jeffery A. *Responsiveness in Urban Schools: A Study of School System Adaptation to Parental Preferences in an Urban Environment,* June 1972 ERIC ED 063 569

Rafky, David M. *Race Relations in Higher Education,* 2 vols., 1972 ERIC ED 060 773

Rainsford, George N. *Congress and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century.* Knoxville, Tenn.: University of Tennessee Press, 1972

Rajpal, Puran L. "Teacher Judgments of Minority Children," *Integrated Education,* 10 (November-December 1972)

Ramirez, Arnulfo G. *The Spoken English of Spanish-Speaking Pupils in a Bilingual and Monolingual School Setting: An Analysis of Syntactic Development.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1974

Rangel, Jorge C. and Carlos M. Alcala. "De Jure Segregation of Chicanos in Texas Schools," *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review,* 7 (March 1972) 307-391

Randquist, Bobby Wayne. *An Investigation of the Educational Attainment and Opportunities of American Indian Students in the Anadarko Public School System.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-23,990)

Rayson, Harvey. *An Investigation of the Anxiety Level of Negro and White Students in an Integrated School, an All-Negro School, and an All-White School.* Master's thesis, Stephen F. Austin State University, 1971

Record, Wilson. "The White Professional Educators and the Black Ghetto Schools," *Journal of Negro Education,* 39 (1970) 44-49

Reddick, L. D. "The Education of Negroes in States Where Separate Schools Are Not Legal," *Journal of Negro Education* (Summer 1947)

Reed, T. Edward. "Caucasian Genes in American Negroes," *Science,* 165 (August 22, 1969) 762-768

Reiss, Elizabeth Waldkoetter. *The Influence of Race and Social Class Upon the Measurement of Intelligence, Cognitive Style, and Direct Learning Ability.* Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-27, 089)

Research Department, City School District, Syracuse, N.Y. "Study of the Effect of Integration–Washington Irving and Host Pupils," pp. 323-326 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester, N.Y. September 16-17, 1966.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

__________. "Study of the Effect of Integration–Croton and Edward Smith Elementary School Pupils," pp. 327-328 in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Rochester. N.Y. September 16-17, 1966.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

Residents of Bedford-Stuyvesant. *Community Attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant: An Area Study. Summer 1967.* New York: Center for Urban Education, July 1968

Resource Management Corporation. *Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, February 15, 1972,* ERIC ED 058 470

Rhodes, Albert Lewis. *Effects of Parental Expectations on Educational Plans of White and Nonwhite Adolescents,* September 1968 ERIC ED 027 096

Rice, Lawrence D. *The Negro in Texas, 1874-1900.* Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1971

Richardson, Ken and David Spears with Martin Richards (eds.) *Race and Intelligence. The Fallacies Behind the Race-IQ Controversy.* Baltimore, Md.: Penguin, 1972

Richmond, Bert O. *Creative and Cognitive Abilities of White and Negro Children,* 1968 ERIC ED 030 922

Richmond, David M. H. *Educational Horizons Among Lower Class Negro High School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-12,715)

Riessman, Frank. *Workers' Attitudes Toward Participation and Leadership.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1955 (University Microfilms Order No. 13,999)

Rist, Ray C., Jr. "The Milieu of a Ghetto School as a Precipitator of Educational Failure," *Phylon,* 33 (Winter 1972) 348-360

__________. *The Socialization of the Ghetto Child into the Urban School System.* Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1970

———. *The Urban School. A Factory for Failure. An Ethnographic Study of Education in American Society.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1973

Ritterband, Paul. "Ethnic Power and the Public Schools: The New York City School Strike of 1968," *Sociology of Education,* 47 (Spring 1974)

——— and Richard Silverstein. "Group Disorders in the Public Schools," *American Sociological Review,* 38 (August 1973) 466-477

——— and ———. "More on School Disorders,". *American Sociological Review,* 39 (February 1974) 135-137

Rivera, Ramon J., Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein. "Freedom Day II in Chicago," *Integrated Education,* August-September 1964

Rivers, Larry Wendell. *The Stability of Differential Patterns of Mental Abilities in Children from Different Ethnic Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-21,421)

Riverside, Calif. Tabular Materials released by Riverside Unified School District, August 1973: "Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 12A, Administered May 1973, Grade One;" Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 23A, and Large-Thorndike Intelligence Test, Primary Battery, Level 2, Form A, Administered, May 1973"; and "Cooperative Primary Tests, Form 23B, Administered May 1973"

Robinson, Isaiah E., Jr. "Preparation for Life: The Black Classroom," p. 8 in Jim Haskins (ed.), *Black Manifesto for Education.* New York: Morrow, 1973

Robinson, Dr. Remus G. in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Hearings Held in Detroit, Michigan.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961

Roche, Richard J. *Catholic Colleges and the Negro Student.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948

Rochester City School District. *A Three Year Longitudinal Study to Assess A Fifteen Point Plan to Reduce Racial Isolation and Provide Quality Integrated Education for Elementary Level Pupils.* Rochester, N.Y.: Rochester City School District, September 1970 ERIC ED 048 438

Rodgers, Frederick A. "Gain in Programmed and Flexible Presentations," *Elementary School Journal,* 68 (1967-1968)

Rodgers, Jr., Harrell R. "Racial Pride and Black Children," *Integrated Education,* 11 (July-October 1973)

Rodman, Hyman and Patricia Voydanoff. *Social Class and Parents' Aspirations for their Children.* August 1968 ERIC ED 030 482

Rodriguez, Clara. *The Ethnic Queue in the U.S.: The Case of Puerto Ricans.* Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1973 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-24,899)

Rodriguez, Herman. *Some Problems of Bilingualism in Acculturation of Puerto Ricans in New York City.* Master's thesis, City College of New York, 1965 (University of Microfilms Order No. M-1153)

Rodriguez, Valerio Sierra. *Mexican American Pupils' Self-Concept in Public Elementary Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-20,550)

Rogers, David. "Vocational and Career Education: A Critique and Some New Directions," *Teachers College Record,* 74 (1972-1973)

Rohrer, Georgia Kasnetsis. *Racial and Ethnic Identification and Preference in Young Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-33,979)

Rohwer, Jr., William D. "Learning, Race, and School Success," *Review of Educational Research,* 41 (1971)

———, Mary Sue Amon, Nancy Suzuki, and Joel R. Levin. "The Population Differences and Learning Proficiency, *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 62 (1972)

Roper, Susan Stavert. "Race and Assertive Classroom Behavior," *Integrated Education,* 10 (September-October 1972)

Rose, Harold W. "The Development of an Urban Subsystem: The Case of the Negro Ghetto," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 60 (March 1970)

Rose, Steven. "Environmental Effects on Brain and Behavior," in Richardson and Spears with Richards (eds.) *Race and Intelligence,* above

Rosenberg, Morris. *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966

———. "Parental Interest and Children's Self-Concepts," *Sociometry,* March 1963

——— and Roberta G. Simmons. *Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child.*

Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1972

Rosenfeld, Michael. *Negro-White Differences in Intellectual Growth.* August 30, 1968 ERIC ED 024 073

Rosenhan, Daniel L. "Effects of Social Class and Race on Responsiveness to Approval and Disapproval," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 4 (1966)

Rosenthal, Robert. *On the Social Psychology of the Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Further Evidence for Pygmalion Effects and their Mediating Mechanisms Module 53.* New York: M S S Modular Publication, 1974

_________and Lenore Jacobson. *Pygmalion in the Classroom. Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968

Ross, E. A. "Present Problems of Social Psychology," *American Journal of Sociology,* 10 (1905) 468-69

Ross, James John. *A Study of Racially Integrated Rooms in Men's Residence Halls at a State University.* Master's thesis, Illinois State Normal University, 1970

Roth, Rodney W. "The Effects of 'Black Studies' on Negro Fifth Grade Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* 38 (1969) 435-439

. *The Effects of Integral Curriculum on Negro and White Fifth Grade Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-18,095)

_________. "How Negro Fifth Grade Students View 'Black Pride' Concepts," *Integrated Education,* 8 (May-June 1970) 24-27

Rowland, Richard Henry. *Social Contact Between Blacks and Whites and the Relationships to Attitudes in Six Northern Cities.* Doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-3244)

Rubin, Rosalyn A., Cynthia Rosenblatt, and Bruce Balow. "Psychological and Educational Sequelae of Prematurity," *Pediatrics,* 52 (September 1973)

Rubovits, Pamela C. and Martin L. Maehr. "Pygmalion Black and White," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 25 (1973)

Russell, John H. *The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865.* Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins Press, 1913

Ryckman, David B. "A Comparison of Information Processing Abilities of Middle and Lower Class Negro Kindergarten Boys," *Exceptional Children,* 33 (1966-1967) 545-552

_________. *Psychological Processes of Disadvantaged Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-12,417)

Sachdeva, Darshan. "Friendships Among Students in Desegregated Schools, *California Journal of Educational Research,* 23 (1972)

_________. "A Measurement of Changes in Interracial Student Attitudes in Desegregated Schools," *Journal of Educational Research,* 66 (May-June 1973)

Sain, Leonard F. *Occupational Preferences and Expectations of Negro Students Attending a High School Located in a Lower Socio-Economic Area.* Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-10,119)

St. John, Nancy H. "De Facto Segregation and Interracial Association in High School," *Sociology of Education,* Summer 1964

_________. "The Effect of Segregation on the Aspirations of Negro Youth," *Harvard Educational Review,* Summer 1966

_________. "The Elementary Classroom as a Frog Pond: Self-Concept, Sense of Control, and Social Context," *Social Forces,* 49 (1970)

_________. *School Integration, Classroom Climate, and Achievement,* January 1971 ERIC ED 052 269

_________. and Ralph Lewis. *The Influence of School Racial Context on Academic Achievement.* April 1971 (Later published in *Social Problems,* Summer 1971)

Samuels, Ivan G. *Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement.* Doctoral dissertation Indiana University, 1958 (University Microfilms Order No. 58-2934)

Samuels, Joseph Maurice. "Busing, Reading, and Self in New Haven," *Integrated Education,* 10 (November-December 1972) pp. 23-28

_________. *A Comparison of Projects Representative of Compensatory; Busing; and Non-Compensatory Program for Inner-City Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-14,252)

Samuels, Shirley C. "An Investigation Into the Self Concepts of Lower and Middle Class Black and White Kindergarten Children," *Journal of Negro Education,* 42 (Fall 1973)

Sanchez, Armand J. *Self-Concept of Mexican-American Youth: The Stability of Self-Concept of Mexican American Youth in Relation to Mexican Cultural Values.* Master's thesis, Fresno State College, 1967

Sanders, Charles L. "A Frank Interview with Roy Wilkins," *Ebony* 29 (April 1974)

San Francisco Unified School District. *Evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District Desegregation/Integration 1971-72.* San Francisco, Calif.: San Francisco Unified School District, October 1972

Sarratt, Reed. *The Ordeal of Desegregation. The First Decade.* New York: Harper and Row, 1966

Sartain, James A. *Attitudes of Parents and Children Towards Desegregation.* Doctoral disseration, Vanderbilt University, 1966 (University Microfilms No. 66-10,999)

Sarthory, Joseph A. *The Effects of Ability Grouping Multi-Cultural School Situations.* Doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11,664)

Sattler, Jerome M. "Racial-Experimenter Effects," in Miller and Dreger (eds.), *Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in the United States,* above.

Savage, Jr., James Edward. *Testers' Influence on Children's Intellectual Performance.* Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-7839)

Savage, LeMoyne W. *Academic Achievement of Black Students Transferring from a Segregated Junior High School to an Integrated High School.* Master's thesis, Viriginia State College, July 1971

Sawyer, Robert M. *The Gaines Case: Its Background and Influence on the University of Missouri and Lincoln University 1936-1950.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-9000)

Schafer, Walter E. and Carol Olexca. *High School Track Position and Academic Achievement,* April 1969 ERIC ED 303 188

Schlesinger, Ina and Michael D'Amore. *Children in the Balance.* New York: Citation Press, 1971

Schmuck, Richard and Margaret B. Luszki. *A Comparison of Negro and White Students in Several Small Midwest Communities.* No place: No publisher, no date.

Schneider, Frank Wheeler. "Conforming Behavior of Black and White Children," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 16 (1970) 466-471

__________. *Differences Between Negro and White School Children in Conforming Behavior.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-17,040)

Schneider, Jeffery Michael. *An Investigation of Social-Psychological Variables Comprising School Normative Academic Climate in High- and Low-Achieving White-Urban, Black-Urban, and Rural Elementary Schools with School Mean Socio-Economic Status Controlled.* Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-29,777)

Sciara, Frank J. "Perceptions of Negro Boys Regarding Color and Occupational Status," *Child Study Journal,* 1 (Summer 1971)

Scott, George D. and others. *Indians and Their Education in Chicago,* November 1969 ERIC ED 039 079

Scott, John C., Jr. *Race and Culture Contact in Southeastern Alaska: A Study of the Assimilation and Acculturation of the Wrangell Tlingit and White.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1953

Scott, Ralph. "Social Class, Race, Seriating and Reading Readiness: A Study of Their Relationship at the Kindergarten Level," *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* 115 (1969) 87-96

__________ and Smith, James E. "Ethnic and Demographic Variables and Achievement Scores of Preschool Children," *Psychology in the Schools,* 9 (1972) 174-182

Scott, Wayne. *A Study of Bused and Non-Bused Children.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Grand Rapids Public Schools, June 1970

Scrofani, Philip J., Antanas Suziedelis, and Milton F. Shore, "Conceptual Ability in Black and White Children of Different Social Classes," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 43 (1973) 541-553

Scudder, Bonnie Todd and Stephen G. Jurs. "Do Bused Negro Children Affect Achievement of

Non-Negro Children," *Integrated Education,* 9 (March-April 1971)

Seda Bonilla, Eduardo. "Bilinqual Education in a Pluralistic Context," *Rican* 1 (May 1974)

Seeley, David S. in U.S. Congress, 89th, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Special Subcommittee on Civil Rights, *Guidelines for School Desegregation. Hearings.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966

Sekora, John. "Murder Relentless and Impassive: The American Academic Community and the Negro College," *Soundings,* 51 (Fall 1968)

Sellers, Barney. "Appendix Background Material," p. 1-65 in A. Philip Randolph Institute, *The Reluctant Guardians: A Survey of Federal Civil Rights Laws,* PB 192 346. Springfield, Va.: Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, December 1969

Shaffer, Ruth C. and Albert Schaffer. "Socialization and the Development of Attitudes Toward Negroes in Alabama," *Phylon,* 27 (1966) 274-285

Shannon, John Howard. *An Analysis of Selected Sociological Variables Related to Special Class Placement Processes As a Function of Race.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-14,990)

Shapiro, Beth Janet. *The Black Athlete at Michigan State University.* Master's Thesis, Michigan State University, 1970

Sharon, Amiel T. "Racial Differences in Newspaper Readership," *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 37 (Winter 1973-1974)

Shaw, Marvin E. "The Self-Image of Black and White Pupils in an Integrated School," *Journal of Personality,* 42 (March 1974)

Sigel, Irving E. and Patricia Olmsted. *Modification of Cognitive Skills Among Lower-Class Negro Children: A Follow-Up Training Study,* August 1968

Silver, Catherine Bodard. *Black Teachers in Urban Schools. The Case of Washington, D.C.* New York: Praeger, 1973

Singer, Dorothy G. *Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-2836

__________. "Reading, Writing, and Race Relations," *Trans-Action,* June 1967

Singh, Surendra Pratap. *A Comparison Between Privileged Negroes, Underprivileged Negroes, Privileged Whites, and Underprivileged White Children on a Test of Creativity.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-232)

Sitkei, Emil George. *Comparative Structure of Intellect in Middle and Lower-Class Four-Year-Old Children of Two Ethnic Groups.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5310)

Sledge, Bettye. "Black Education In Evanston Public Schools: A Look at the Twenties and Thirties," an interview with Melvin Smith, *Integrated Education,* 12 (September-October 1974)

Slone, Irene Wholl. *The Effects of One School Pairing on Pupil Achievement, Anxieties, and Attitudes.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11,808)

Smith, D. B. *Report On Differences in Ethnic Learning Styles,* 1966 ERIC ED 015 253

Smith, Eddie D. *Attitudes of Bibb County Elementary School Teachers Toward Integrated Schools.* Master's thesis, Fort Valley State College, 1971

Smith, Merle Edward. *The Effects of an Experimental Program to Improve Self-Concept, Attitudes Toward School and Achievement of Negro Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Grade Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-4736)

Smith, Paul V. "Pupil Transportation: A Brief History," *Inequality in Education,* No. 11 (March 1972)

Smith, Ralph V., Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bashur, and Gary W. Shannon. *Community Interaction and Racial Integration in the Detroit Area: An Ecological Analysis.* Ypsilanti, Mich.: Eastern Michigan University, September 8, 1967

Smith, Waldron P. *The Attitudes and Beliefs of Teachers Concerning the Education of American Indian Children in the Southwest,* March 1970 ERIC ED 051 957

Smith, William F. *A Study of Biracial Interaction in a Racially Balanced School.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-17,778)

Soares, Anthony T. and Louise M. Soares. "Self-Perceptions of Culturally Disadvantaged Children," *American Educational Research Journal,* 6 (1969)

Soares, Louise M. and Anthony T. Soares "Self-Concepts of Disadvantaged and Advantaged Students," *Child Study Journal,* 1 (Winter 1970-1971)

Solkoff, Norman. "Race of Experimenter as a Variable in Research with Children," *Developmental Psychology,* 7 (1972)

Solomon, Daniel, Robert Parelius, and Thomas V. Busse. *Dimensions of Achievement-Related Behavior Among Lower Class Negro Parents* ERIC ED 021 904

Sorkin, Alan L. "A Comparison of Quality Characteristics of Negro and White Private and Church-Related Colleges and Universities in the South," *College and University* 46 (Spring 1971) 199-210

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. *Proceedings, National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican Americans,* 1968 ERIC ED 0131 345

Spear, Allen H. *Black Chicago. The Making of a Negro Ghetto, 1890-1920.* Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1967

Spellman, Judith B., Gertrude D. Peterson, and Ann H. Rosenthal. *Adapting to Changing Racial and Ethnic Composition: A Survey of San Francisco Teachers and Principals.* Menlo Park, Calif.: Stanford Research Institute, May 15, 1967

Spencer, Margaret Beale and Frances Degen Horowitz. "Effects of Systematic Social and Token Reinforcement of the Modification of Racial and Color Concept Attitudes in Black and White Preschool Children," *Developmental Psychology,* 9 (1973)

Spiegel, John P. in U.S. Congress, 90th, 1st Session, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *Antiriot Bill–1967 Hearings*

Spilka, Bernard. *Alienation and Achievement Among Oglala Sioux Secondary School Students,* August 1970 ERIC ED 045 225

Spurlock, Jeanne. "Some Consequences of Racism for Children," in Charles V. Willie, Bernard M. Kramer and Bertram S. Brown (eds.), *Racism and Mental Health.* Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973

Stabler, John R., Edward E. Johnson, and Melvyn A. Berke. *The Relationship Between Race and Perception of Racially-Related Stimuli in Preschool Children,* 1967 ERIC ED 030 483

Stapleton, Jack L. *Effect of a Head Teacher's Race on the Race Awareness of Black Headstart Children.* Master's degree, DePaul University, 1970

Stark, Jay Irwin. *The Pattern of Resource Allocation in Education: The Detroit Public Schools 1940 to 1960.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 70-4202)

Starnes, Thomas Albert. *An Analysis of the Academic Achievement of Negro Students in the Predominantly White Schools of a Selected Florida County.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-14,712)

Steigelmann, Val Victor. *Patterns of Racial Identity Imagery in Inner-City Male Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1971 (University Microfilms Order No. 72-6339)

Stein, Annie. "A New View of Reading Scores," *Integrated Education* 12 (September-October 1974) 20-24

Stewart, Lawrence H., Arthur A. Dole, and Yeuell Y. Harris. "Cultural Differences in Abilities During High School," *American Education Research Journal,* 4 (1967)

Stinson, Harold N. *The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students.* Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963 (University Microfilms Order No. 64-5089)

Stocking, Jr., George Ward. *American Social Scientists and Race Theory: 1890-1915.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1960 (University Microfilms Order No. 60-3698)

Stokes, Charles Alphonso. *Some Effects of Schooling, Age, Race, and Socio-Economic Status on the Cognitive Development of Primary School Boys.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-4742)

Stones, Michael E. "School Administrator Attitudes and Racism," *Integrated Education,* 11 (March-April 1973)

Strain, Barbara. *Developmental Trends in the Selective Preception of Race and Affect by Young Negro and Caucasian Children.* Master's thesis, George Peabody College, 1970. (Also published by the John F. Kennedy Center for Research in Education and Human Development, George Peabody College.)

Straley, Harry Goff. *A Comparative Study of the Academic Achievement and Social Adjustment of Transported and Non-Transported High School Seniors.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1956 (University Microfilms Order No. 20,352)

Strang, Jr., William Jacob. *The Self-Concepts of Children in Elementary Schools with Differing Proportions of Negro and White Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-8059)

Sulzer, Jefferson L., Wesley J. Hansche, and Frederick Koenig. "Nutrition and Behavior in Head Start Children: Results from the Tulane Study," in David J. Kallen (ed.) *Nutrition, Development and Social Behavior, Proceedings of the Conference on the Assessment of Tests of Behavior from Studies of Nutrition in the Western Hemisphere.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

Swanson, Ernest W. and John A. Griffin (eds.) *Public Education in the South. Today and Tomorrow. A Statistical Survey.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1955

Sydnor, Charles S. *Slavery in Mississippi.* New York: Appleton-Century, 1933

Szasz, Margaret. *Education and the American Indian. The Road to Self-Determination, 1928-1973.* Albuquerque, N.Mex.: University of New Mexico Press, 1974

Taba, Hilda. *School Culture Studies of Participation and Leadership.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1955

Taeuber, Karl E. and Alma F. *Negroes in Cities.* Chicago, Ill.: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965

Task Force on Employment Problems of Black Youth. *The Job Crisis for Black Youth.* New York: Praeger, 1971

Taylor, Alreutheus Ambush. *The Negro in the Reconstruction of Virginia.* Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1926

Taylor, Charlotte P. *Some Changes in Self-Concept in the First Year of Desegregation Schooling: The Outward Walls and the Inward Scars.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, 1967 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-15,568)

Teele, James E. *Evaluating School Busing. Case Study of Boston's Operation Exodus.* New York: Praeger, 1973

__________, Ellen Jackson, and Clara Mayo. "Family Experiences in Operation Exodus," in U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Hearing Held in Boston, Massachusetts, October 4-5, 1966.* Washington, D.C.: Government PrintingOffice, 1967

Tefft, Stanton K. "Anomy, Values and Culture Change Among Teen-Age Indians: An Exploratory Study, " *Sociology of Education,* 40 (1967)

Ten Houten, Warren David. *Socialization, Race and the American High School.* Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-444)

Thomas, Alexander. *Retardation in Intellectual Development of Lower-Class Puerto Rican Children in New York City.* New York: New York University Medical Center, May 31, 1969

Thomas, Charles Richard. *A Study of Lay Participation in the Elimination of DeFacto Racial Segregation in a Northern School District.* Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-1986)

Thomas, Cleveland A. "The Independent School and Desegregation," *School Review,* 69 (1961)

Thomas, Robert K. "Colonialism: Classic and Internal," *New University Thought,* 4 (Winter 1966-67)

Thompson Carolyn E. and Frances L. Dyke. *First Interim Evaluation Report: Urban-Suburban Pupil Transfer Program 1971-1972.* Rochester, N.Y.: City School District, August 1972

Thompson Charles H. "The Conclusion of Scientists Relative to Racial Differences," *Journal of Negro Education,* 3 (July 1934)

__________. "75 Years of Negro Education," *Crisis,* 45 (July 1938)

Thompson, Daniel C. *Private Black Colleges At the Crossroads.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1973

Thorpe, Claiburne Burnice. *Status, Race and Aspiration. A Study of the Desire of High School Students to Enter a Professional or a Technical Occupation.* Doctoral dissertation, New School for Social Research, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-17, 870)

Tiller, Jr., Thomas Cato. *The Status of Racial Integration in Men's Social Fraternities at a Select Sample of Southeastern Universities.* Master's thesis, Viriginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, n.d.

Tindall, George Brown. *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900.* Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1952

Toder, Eric Jay. *The Distribution of Public School Teachers by Race and Income Class in an Urban Metropolitan Area. Final Report,* March 1971 ERIC ED 050 210

Trent, Richard D. "The Relation Between Expressed Self-Acceptance and Expressed Attitudes Toward Negroes and Whites Among Negro Children," *Journal of Genetic Psychology,* September 1957

Trillin, Calvin. *An Education in Georgia. The Integration of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes.* New York: Viking, 1962

Trimble, Joseph E. *An Index of the Social Indicators of the American Indian in Oklahoma,* January 19, 1972 ERIC ED 064 002

Trowbridge, Norma, Lambert, and Lisa. "Self Concept and Socioeconomic Status," *Child Study Journal,* 2 (1972) 123-143

———. "Self-Concept and Socio-economic Status in Elementary School Children," *American Educational Research Journal,* 9 (Fall 1972)

Tuckman, Bruce W. and Milton Bierman. *Beyond Pygmalion: Galatea in the School,* 1971 ERIC ED 047 077

Tuddenham, Read D. The Nature and Measurement of Intelligence," in Leo Postman (ed), *Psychology in the Making. Histories of Selected Research Problems.* New York: Knopf, 1962

Tulkin, Steven R. "Race, Class, Family and School Achievement," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 9 (1968)

Turnage, Martha. *The Principal: Change-Agent in Desegregation.* Chicago, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1972

Turner, Jonathan H. "Structural Conditions of Achievement Among Whites and Blacks in the Rural South," *Social Problems,* 19 (Spring 1972)

Ullman, Victor. *Martin R. Delany. The Beginnings of Black Nationalism.* Boston, Mass.: Beacon, 1971

Underwood, Jerald Ross. *An Investigation of Educational Opportunity for the Indian in Northeastern Oklahoma.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-14,258)

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Historical Statistics of the United States. Colonial Times to 1957.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960

———. *Negro Population in the United States, 1790-1905.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Civil Rights, U.S.A. Public Schools Southern States. 1962.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962

———. *The Diminishing Barrier: A Report on School Desegregation in Nine Communities.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, December 1972

———. *Education 1961 . . . Report.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961

———. *Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960

———. *Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1970 and April, 1971

———. *The Excluded Student. Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1972

———. *Federal Enforcement of School Desegregation.* Washington, D.C.: The Commission, September 11, 1969

———. *Hearing Held in New York, February 14-15, 1972.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

———. *Mexican-American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, August 1972

———. *1964 Staff Report on Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964

———. *1963 Staff Report.* Public Education. Washingon, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964

———. *Public Knowledge and Busing Opposition: An Interpretation of a New National Survey.* Washington, D.C.: The Commission, March 11, 1973

———. *Racial Isolation in the Public Schools,* 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

———. Staff Report. *Research Methods Employed in the Mexican American Education Study.* Washington, D.C.: The Commission, October 1972

———. *School Desegregation in Ten Communities.* Washington, D.C.: The Commission, June 1973

———. "School Integration in Several Urban Areas," p. 205 in U.S. Congress, 92nd, 2nd session, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, *School Busing Hearings* . . . Part 1, Serial No. 32. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972

———. *Southern School Desegregation 1966-67.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967

———. *Teachers and Students: Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 1973

———. *Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, February 1974

———. *The Unfinished Education. Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October 1972

U.S. Commissioner of Education. *Special Report of the Commissioner of Education on the Improvement of Public Schools in the District of Columbia, 1871.* Part II. *Legal Status of the Colored Population in Respect to Schools and Education in the Different States.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1871

U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy,* vol. II: *Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity.* New York: Harper and Row, 1948

U.S. Congress, 91st 1st session, Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Indian Education, *Indian Education, 1969. Hearings* . . ., Part 4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969

———, 91st, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Opportunity Hearings.* . . ., Part 8 – *Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970

———, 92nd, 2nd session, Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. *Comprehensive Indian Education Act. Hearings* . . . Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972

———, 92nd, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity. *Environment, Intelligence, and Scholastic Achievement.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, June 1972

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights. *Racial and Ethnic Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, 1970.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972

U.S. Department of Transportation, School Bus Task Force. *Pupil Transportation Safety Program Plan.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1973

Urban Education Task Force. "Report on Urban Education," *Congressional Record,* January 20, 1970, E 52

Useem, Elizabeth Livingston. "White Students and Token Desegregation, *Integrated Education,* 10 (September-October 1972)

———. *White Suburban Secondary Students in Schools with Token Desegregation: Correlates of Racial Attitudes.* Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1971 (University Microfilm Order No. 71-20,276)

Vaca, Nick C. "The Mexican-American in the Social Sciences 1912-1970. Part I: 1912-1935," *El Grito,* 3 (Spring 1970) 3-24

Valenzuela, Alvaro Miguel. *The Relationship Between Self-Concept, Intelligence, Socio-Economic Status and School Achievement Among Spanish-American Children in Omaha.* Field Report, University of Nebraska, Omaha, 1971

Vane, Julia R. "Relation of Early School Achievement to High School Achievement When Race, Intelligence and Socioeconomic Factors are Equated," *Psychology in the Schools,* 3 (1966) 124-129

———, Jonathan Weitzman, and Adrian P. Applebaum. "Performance of Negro and White Children and Problem and Nonproblem Children on the Stanford Binet Scale," *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 22 (1966)

Vasquez, James. "Measurement of Intelligence and Language Differences," *Aztlan,* 3 (Spring 1972)

Vazquez, Hector in U.S. Congress, 91st, 2nd session, Senate, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, *Equal Educational Opportunity Hearings,* Part 8. *Equal Educational Opportunity for Puerto Rican Children.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1970

Veblen, Thorstein. "The Evolution of the Scientific Point of View," in *The Place of Science in Modern Civilization and Other Essays.* New York: Viking, 1942

Verlinden, Charles. *The Beginnings of Modern Colonization.* Tr. Yvonne Freccero. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1970

Vernon, Philip E. Review of Jensen in *Contemporary Psychology,* 15 (March 1970) 161-162

__________. "Vernon on Jensen," *New Society,* December 14, 1972

Veroff, Joseph and Stanton Peele. "Initial Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement Motivation of Negro Elementary School Children," *Journal of Social Issues,* 25 (1969) 82-93

Vetta, Stam. "Conservation in Aboriginal Children and 'Genetic Hypothesis'," *International Journal of Psychology,* 7 (1972)

Vincent, David. "The Uneducation of Black Students," *Memphis Commercial Appeal,* March 27, 1970

Visscher, Sietwender Hermberg. *A Preliminary Study of Some Attitudes Toward Cultural and Educational Conflicts of Indian Children in Montana.* Master's thesis, Montana State University, 1970

Vogel, Virgil J. *The Indian in American History.* Chicago, Ill.: Integrated Education Associates, 1968

Vogler, James Donald. *The Influence of Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status on the Pictorial Test of Intelligence.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 68-11, 883)

Volkman, Jacob. *The Informal Social Environment in a Public Housing Development: A Survey of the Social Behavior, the Attitudes, and the Feelings of Project Tenants Toward the Project and Its Population.* Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order no. 67-127)

Vredevoe, Lawrence E. "The Effects of Desegregation on School Discipline," *Educational Digest,* April 1965

__________. "The Effort to Desegregate and Its Effects Upon School Discipline and Attitudes," *Journal of Secondary Education,* February 1967

Wagoner, Jr., Jennings L., Charles A. Glatt and William A. Gaines. "Student Relationships and Activities in Desegregated Schools," *High School Journal,* 54 (1970-1971) 188-201

Walberg, Herbert J. *An Evaluation of an Urban Suburban School Busing Program: Student Achievement and Perception of Class Learning Environment,* February 1971 ERIC ED 047 076

__________and Mark Bargen. "School Equality" in Herbert J. Walberg (ed.), *Evaluating Educational Performance. A Sourcebook of Methods, Instruments, and Examples.* Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974

Walker, Kenneth DeLeon. *Effects of Social and Cultural Isolation Upon the Self-Concepts of Negro Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-6518)

Walker, Olive. "The Windsor Hills School Story," *Integrated Education,* 8 (May-June 1970) 4-9

Walters, Raymond. "The Cincinnati Meeting of the Association of American Colleges," *School and Society,* 67 (January 31, 1948)

Ward, Susan Harris, and John Braun. "Self-Esteem and Racial Preference in Black Children," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry,* 42 (July 1972)

Wash, Brenda Dolores Lakin. *The Black Child's Self-Concept: A Study of Ten- and Eleven-Year-Olds Varying in Sex, Socioeconomic Background and Integrated vs. Segregated School Settings.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-10, 489)

Washburn, Sherwood L. in Tumin, Melvin M. (ed.), *Race and Intelligence, A Scientific Evaluation.* New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1963

Wax, Murray L. *Gophers or Gadflies: Problems of Indian School Boards,* March 1970 ERIC 041 684

__________. *Indian Americans, Unity and Diversity.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971

Wayson, William W. *Expressed Motives of Teachers in Slum Schools.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1966

Webster, Staten W. "The Influence of Interracial Contact on Social Acceptance in a Newly Integrated School," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 52 (1961)

———. *Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh-Grade Pupils.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960

———and Nathaniel Pugh. *The Team Approach to Solving Problems of Desegregation and the Disadvantaged Student in the Oakland Pulic Schools,* April 26, 1967 ERIC ED 030 701

Weddington, Rachel T. *The Relative Influence of Social Class and Color on the Stereotypes of Young Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Committee on Human Development, University of Chicago, 1948

Weinberg, Meyer. "De Facto Segregation: Fact or Artifact?" *Integrated Education,* 1 (April 1963)

———. *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal,* 2nd edition Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970

———. "From Discipline to Disorder," *Intergroup,* 2 (February 1972) 4-5

———. *Race and Place: A Legal History of the Neighborhood School.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968

———. *Research on School Desegregation: Review and Prospect.* Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965

———. "White Children in the Desegregation Process," *Integrated Education,* 12 (July-August 1974)

———and Oscar E. Shabat. *Society and Man.* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965

Weiner, Jane. *Desegregation Evolves Into Integration in Greenburgh.* New York: New York State Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, 1966

Weinland, Thomas Pogue. *A History of the I.Q. in America, 1890-1941.* Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 73-8991)

Weinman, Janice Jenny. *Local Control Over the Schools in Two American Indian Communities: A Preliminary Examination of Structural Constraints and "Internal Control" Attitudes,* 1970 ERIC ED 060 988

Weiss, Leonard and Jeffery G. Williamson. "Black Education, Earnings, and Interregional Migration: Some New Evidence, " *American Economic Review,* 62 (June 1972) 372-383

Weissman, Julius. *An Exploratory Study of Communication Patterns of Lower-Class Negro and Puerto Rican Mothers and Pre-School Children.* Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966 (University Microfilms Order No. 67-5551)

Welch, Finis. "Black-White Differences in Returns to Schooling," *American Economic Review,* 63 (December 1973) 893-907

———. "Education and Racial Discrimination," June 1972 Unpublished.

Wells, Danny. "Social Life Slow for WVU Blacks," *Charleston Gazette,* June 1, 1974

Welsing, Frances Cress. "The 'Conspiracy' to Make Blacks Inferior," *Ebony,* 29 (September 1974)

Wendland, Marilyn Marie. *Self-Concept in Southern Negro and White Adolescents As Related to Rural-Urban Residence.* Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-1995)

Werner, Emmy E., Kenneth Simonian, and Ruth S. Smith. "Ethnic and Socioeconomic Status Differences in Abilities and Achievement among Preschool and School-Age Children in Hawaii," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 75 (1968)

Werner, Norma E. and Idella M. Evans. "Perception of Prejudice in Mexican-American Preschool Children," *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 27 (1968)

Wessman, Alden E. *Evaluation of Project ABC (A Better Chance). An Evaluation Dartmouth College-Independent Schools Scholarship Programs for Disadvantated High School Students,* April 1969 ERIC ED 031 549

Wharton, Vernon L. *The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890.* New York: Harper and Row, 1965 reprint

Whipple, Guy Montrose (ed.) *Intelligence: Its Nature and Nurture.* Part I: *Comparative and Critical Exposition.* Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1940

White, Arthur O. "Mid-Nineteenth Century Movements for Desegregated Schools in Six Northern Communities," *Integrated Education,* 10 (November-December 1972)

White, Dan A. "Effects of Busing on Urban School Students," *Educational Leadership*, 29 (1971) 255-257

———. *The Effects of Public School Transportation Upon the Overall School Adjustment of Urban Elementary School Students.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-1509)

White, Kinnard. "Belief in Reinforcement Control Among Southern Negro Adolescents: The Effects of School Desegregation, Socioeconomic Status, and Sex of Student," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 85 (1971)

———and James H. Knight. "School Desegregation, Socioeconomic Status, Sex, and the Aspirations of Southern Negro Adolescents," *Journal of Negro Education*, 42 (Winter 1973)

White, Maurice Orange. *Alienation and Self-Esteem as They Relate to Race, Sex, Socioeconomic and School Variables in Urban High School Age Youth.* Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1963 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-19, 177)

White, Sheldon H. and others. *Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations,* I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

White, William F. and Bert O. Richmond. "Perception of Self and of Peers by Economically Deprived Black and Advantaged White Fifth Graders," *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 30 (1970)

White Plains Public Schools. "Analysis of Pupil Registration by School Showing Per Cent Negro." August 30, 1967

Whitmore, Jr., Paul Gordon. *A Study of School Desegregation: Attitude Change and Scale Validation.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956 (University Microfilms Order 20, 501)

Wicker, Tom. "Integration and Innovation," *New York Times,* April 2, 1974

Wielk, Carol. "White Academic Failure in Brooklyn High Schools," *Community,* 2 (February 1970)

Wilcox, Preston R. "Teacher Attitudes and Student Achievement," *Teachers College Record,* 68 (1966-1967)

Wiley, David E. and Annegret Harnischfeger. "Explosion of a Myth: Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles," *Educational Researcher,* 3 (April 1974)

Williams, Frank E. *An Analysis of Some Differences Between Negro High School Seniors From a Segregated High School and a Nonsegregated High School in Brevard County, Florida.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1968 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-16,050)

Williams, John E. and C. Drew Edwards. "An Exploratory Study of the Modification of Color and Racial Concept Attitudes in Preschool Children," *Child Development,* 40 (1969)

Williams, Joyce H. *School Desegregation and Racial Fear in a Southern Community.* Master's thesis. Fort Valley State College, 1971

Williams, Robert L. "Cognitive and Affective Components of Southern Negro Students' Attitudes Towards Academic Integration," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 76 (1968) 107-111

———and Harry Byars. "The Effect of Academic Integration on the Self-Esteem of Southern Negro Students," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 80 (1973)

———and Spurgeon Cole. "Scholastic Attitudes of Southern Negro Students," *Journal of Negro Education,* Winter 1969

Williams, Jr., Robin M. and Margaret W. Ryan (eds.) *Schools in Transition. Community Experiences in Desegregation.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1954

Willie, Charles V. with Jerome Beker. *Race Mixing in the Public Schools.* New York: Praeger, 1973

Wilson, Alan B. *The Effect of Residential Segregation Upon Educational Achievement and Aspirations.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1960

———. "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," *American Sociological Review,* December 1959

Winkler, Donald R. *School Inputs, Educational Production, and the Achievement Gap Between Blacks and Whites.* A paper presented to the December 1972 Winter meeting of the Econometric Society

Winston, Michael R. "Through the Back Door: Academic Racism and the Negro Scholar in Historical Perspective," *Daedalus,* 100 (Summer 1971)

Winther, Sven F., E. Bruce Potter and William H. Huber. *A Longitudinal Study of the Beginning*

Freshman Class of 1963 at the University of New Mexico. The Invisible Student. May 1969 ERIC ED 030 532

Wise, James H. "Self-Reports by Negro and White Adolescents to the Draw-a-Person," *Perceptual and Motor Skills,* 28 (1969)

Withycombe, Jeraldine Smith. *An Analysis of Self-Concept and Social Status of Paiute Indian and White Elementary School Children in Nevada.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1970 (University Microfilms Order No. 71-16,058)

Witty, Paul A. and A. I. Decker. "A Comparative Study of the Educational Attainment of Negro and White Children," *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 18 (1927)

Wolman, T. G. "Learning Effects of Integration in New Rochelle," *Integrated Education* (December 1964-January 1965)

Wood, Bruce Hartley. *The Effects of Busing Versus Non-Busing on the Intellectual Functioning of Inner City, Disadvantaged Elementary School Children.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1969 (University Microfilms Order No. 69-5186)

Woodson, Carter G. *The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861, 2nd ed.* Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers, 1919

Woodward, Jane W. *A Sociometric Study of Voluntary DeFacto Segregation in an Integrated School.* Master's research report, Wake Forest University, 1970

Woofter, Jr., Thomas Jackson. *Negro Migration.* New York: Gray, 1920

Worcester, Everett and Carl Ashbaugh. "Socioeconomic Status, Ethnic Background, and Student Unrest," *Clearing House,* 47 (October 1972)

Wright, Richard. *Black Boy. A Record of Childhood and Youth.* New York: Harper and Row, 1945

Wylie, Ruth C. *The Self-Concept.* Rev. ed. Volume One: *A Review of Methodological Considerations and Measuring Instruments.* Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 1974

__________and Edwin B. Hutchins. "Schoolwork-Ability Estimates and Aspirations as a Function of Socio-economic Level, Race and Sex," *Psychological Reports,* 21 (1967)

Wynn, Cordell. "Black and White in Bibb County Classrooms," *Integrated Education,* 9 (July-August 1971)

Yando, Regina, Edward Zigler, and Maxine Gates. "The Influence of Negro and White Teachers Rated as Effective or Noneffective on the Performance of Negro and White Lower Class Children," *Developmental Psychology,* 5 (September 1971)

Yates, Elizabeth. *Howard Thurman. Portrait of a Practical Dreamer.* New York: John Day, 1964

Yee, Albert H., and Marvin J. Fruth. "Do Black Studies Make a Difference in Ghetto Children's Achievement and Attitudes?" *Journal of Negro Education,* 42 (Winter 1973)

Young, Kimball. *Mental Differences in Certain Immigrant Groups, Psychological Tests of South Europeans in Typical California Schools Bearing on the Educational Policy and on the Problems of Racial Contacts in This Country.* University of Oregon Publications, No. 11. Eugene, Oreg.: Oregon University Press, 1922

Zdep, Stanley M. "Educating Disadvantaged Urban Children in Suburban Schools: An Evaluation," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 1 (1971)

Zeigler, Harmon and Michael Boss. "Racial Problems and Policy in the American Public Schools," *Sociology of Education,* 47 (Summer 1974)

Zeta Acosta, Oscar. "The East L.A. 13 vs. the L.A. Superior Court," *El Grito,* 3 (Winter 1970)

Zigler, Edward, Willa D. Abelson, and Victoria Seitz. "Motivational Factors in the Performance of Economically Disadvantaged Children on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test," *Child Development,* 44 (1973)

Zimet, Melvin. *Decentralization and School Effectiveness. A Case Study of the 1969 Decentralization Law in New York City.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1973

Zinberg, Norman E. "A Group Approach With the Integration Crisis," *Mental Hygiene* (April 1967)

Zitron, Celia Lewis. *The New York City Teachers Union 1916-1964* New York: Humanities Press, 1968

TABLE OF CASES

Adams v. Richardson, (1972), 31
Alexander v. Holmes, 396 U.S. 19 (1969), 24, 25
Bell v. School City of Gary, Indiana, 324 F. 2nd 209 (1963), 27
Booker v. Board of Education of Plainfield, N.J. 45, 131 (1965), 27
Booker v. Tennessee Board of Higher Education, 240 F. 2nd 689 (1957), cert. den., 353 U.S. 965 (1957), 27
Briggs v. Elliot, 137 F. Supp 777, (1955), 23, 26, 27
Brown v. Board of Education, 347, U.S. 483 (1954), 21-27, 96
Brown v. Board of Education, 349. U.S. 294 (1955), 21-27, 219, 256, 286
Brown v. Board of Education, 199 F. Supp. 470, (1955), 209, 256, 286
Bryant et al. v. Barnes, Tax Collector, 106 So. 116 (1925), 19
Chalmers v. Stewart, Ohio 386 (1842), 17-18
Chase v. Stephenson, 71 Ill. 383 (1874), 20
Cisneros v. Corpus Christi, Independent School District, 327 F. Supp. 599 (1970), 287
Claybrook v. Owensboro, 16 Fed. R. 302 (1886), 18
Cumming v. County Board of Education, 175 U.S. 545 (1899), 19, 30
Dobbins v. Commonwealth, 198 Va. 697, 96 S.E. 2nd 157 (1957), 26
Downs v. Board of Education of Kansas City, 336 F 2nd 988 (1964), 26-27
Ever v. Jackson, 232 F. Supp. 241 (1964), 46
Frazier v. Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina, 134 F. Supp. 589, aff'd, 350 U.S. 979 (1956), 30
Gaines v. Missouri, 305 U.S. 337 (1938), 30
Greathouse v. Board of School Commissioners of City of Indianapolis, 198 Ind. 95, 101 (1926), 26
Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, Virginia, 319 U.S. 430 (1968), 23, 25, 27
Jeffries v. Ankeny et al., 11 Ohio 372 (1842), 16
Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1, 413 U.S. 189 (1973), 27, 287
Lewis v. Henley et al., 2 Ind. 334-335 (1850), 18
People v. McFall, 26 Ill. App. 319 (1886), 20
People ex rel Cisco v. School Board, 161 N.Y. 598, 600 (1900), 25-26
Pierce v. Union District School Trustees, 46 N.J. 26 (1884), 20
Piper v. Big Pine School District, 193 Col. 667 (1924), 308
Plessy v. Ferguson 163 U.S. 537 (1896) 19, 25, 26, 31, 86
Pruitt v. Commissioners, 94 N.C. 519 (1886), 18-19
Quick Bear v. Leupp, 210 U.S. 50 (1908), 308
Robert v. Boston, 59 Mass. (5 Cush.) 210 (1849), 18
Stell v. Board of Education of Savannah, 220 F. Supp. 241, 46
Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), 24-25
U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 372 F 2nd (1966), 25
U.S. v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 380 F 2nd, (1967), 23
U.S. v. Texas Education Agency, 287
University of Maryland v. Donald T. Murray, 169 Md. 478 (1936), 30
Van Camp v. Board of Education, 9 Ohio St. 415 (1859), 18

INDEX of Persons Cited

August Little Soldier, Indian tribal leader, 320
Austrin, Harvey R., on inner control and academic achievement, 143
Ausubel, David P., on effect of segregation on black education, 132
Ausubel, Pearl, on effect of segregation on black education, 132
Backman, Margaret Esther, on ethnic factors in intelligence, 61
Badal, Alden W., on achievement and racial composition of schools, 106
Bailey, Stephen K., on study of school protests, 192
Banks, Ronald: on effect of busing on achievement, 114; on school desegregation, 206
Banks, W. Curtis, on racial self-identification, 166
Banks, William M., on racial attitudes, 164
Barber, Ralph W., on open-enrollment and prejudice, 207
Bargan, Mark, on educational expenditures, 87
Barnebey, Norma Saxe, 58
Bartee, Geraldine McMurry, on black self-concept, 156
Bass, Edwin Jordan, on black studies, 168
Bass, Willard P., on Indian-American educational achievement, 300, 302, 312, 314
Baxter, Albert Sidney, on black teacher displacement in Arkansas, 219
Bayton, James A., on racial personality traits, 162
Beckham, Albert Sidney, on white teacher prejudice, 225
Bedell, Frederick D., achievement in White Plains, New York, 114-115
Beecher, Robert Houston, on racial interaction, 185
Beers, Joan S., on black self-esteem, 152
Begab, Michael J., on malnutrition 50
Bennett, William S., on black aspirations, 136
Berk, Richard A., on educational expenditures, 87
Berlin, I. N., on effect of school desegregation on discipline, 183
Berner, Lois, on effect of desegregation on school achievement, 118
Caffrey, Bernard, on social class and racial attitude, 188
Caley, Barbara, on school violence, 193-194
Caplin, Morris Daniel: on self-concept and aspiration, 141; on effect of socioeconomic status and self-esteem, 156
Carpenter, Thomas R., on black self-concept, 150
Carrigan, Patricia, on study of achievement and desegregation, 113
Carter, Robert L.: legal defense fund attorney, 20-21; statement on southern compliance in school desegregation, 21
Carwise, Joseph L., on effect of aspiration and desegregation, 140
Casper, Margery G.: on Indian-American education, 315; on study of Indian-Americans, 317
Cataldo, Everett, on white flight and desegregation, 266-267
Cavalli-Sforza, L. I., on intelligence, 49
Chandler, John T., on Spanish editions of I.Q. tests and mental retardation, 277, 288
Chesler, Mark A.: on public opinion survey of black community, 139; on role of teacher, 232-233; on school desegregation, 202-203, 226; on school desegregation and prejudice, 268; on school desegregation study, 268
Choldin, Harvey M.: on social attitudes in ghetto areas, 261-262; on social contact in ghetto area, 260
Clark, El Nadal, on comparison of academic achievement in segregated and desegregated schools, 120
Clark, Kenneth B.: 81; on black academic records, 196-197; on racial discrimination in colleges, 183; on racial identity studies, 160; on racial self-concept, 167, on racism in education, 228, 238
Clark, Mamie P.: on racial identity studies, 160-168; on racial self-concept, 167

Clasen, Robert E., on cultural bias of I.Q. tests, 289
Claye, Clifton M.: on effect of desegregation and self-concept, 156; on teacher assignment in South, 219
Coats, Brian, on teacher bias, 237
Coats, William D., on racial preference, 235
Cochran, S. B., on study of desegregation, 265
Coffin, Gregory C., school superintendent, 220
Cohen, Elizabeth G., on black proficiency, 195
Cohen, Felix S., on Indian-American rights, 308
D'Amore, Michael, on desegregation study, 208, on teacher prejudice, 235
Daniel, Jessica Henderson, on black soroities, 197
Darden, Joe T., on racial segregation, 259
Darwin, Charles, theory of evolution, 38
Dasen, Pierre R., psychologist, 65
Datcher, Erselle, on racial identification, 166
Datta, Lois-ellen, on black achievement, 225-226
Davenport, Charles B., eugenicist, 39
Davidson, Helen H., on educational achievement 67
Davidson, James D., on racial interraction, 189, 191
Davies, Earnest A., on study of transportation of elementary students, 109
Davis, Allison, 11
Davis, James A., on school busing, 109
Davis, Junius, on white faculty and black reaction, 239
Davis, O. L., on I.Q. testing of Mexican-American children, 288
De Anda, Diane, on Spanish language prohibition, 295
Dearborn, Walter F., psychologist, 44
De Avila, Edward A., psychologist, 66
DeBerry, Clyde, on black participation in education, 268
Decker, A. I., comparative study of educational achievement, 101
Degler, Carl N., on Indian-American assimilation, 319
De Leon, Nephtale, on Spanish language prohibition, 295
Denmark, Florence L., on study of desegregation, 113-114
Dennis, Wayne, on racial changes in black drawings, 161
Dentler, Robert A., on racial composition and school performance, 105
Derbyshire, Robert L.: on black personal identity, 147; on identity crisis in Mexican-Americans, 293
Deslonde, James L., on teacher influence in academic achievement, 234
Diamant, Louis, on racial prejudice, 162
Dickinson, Dallas P., 56
Dilling, H. J., study of achievement of Indian-Americans, 312
DiPasquale, Mary Ellen: on effect of busing on achievement, 114; on school desegregation, 206
Dobzhansky, Theodosius, geneticist, 47
Doke, Larry A., on racial preference study, 166
Douglas, Leonard, on self-concept in Detroit, Michigan schools, 151
Douglass, Frederick: 1; questioning of slavers, 1; on racism, 55; on slavery, 129-130; used pseudonym Frederick Bailey, 129
Dracon, John, on study of Indian-American education, 314-315
Drenth, P. J. D., psychologist, 64
Dreyer, Phillip E.: 315, on Indian-American self-concept, 314-315
DuBois, William, Edward, Burghardt; on black education, 2-3; on black research, 39; on racial discrimination at colleges, 9; on segregated housing, 259; statement on college discrimination, 7; on white teachers in South, 238
Dunlop, G. M., on school busing, 109
Dunmore, Charlotte Jeanette, on voluntary busing, 269
Dunn, Theodore F., on study of racial attitudes, 182
Durig, Kurt Robert, on effect of occupational choice and social class, 140
Dyer, Patricia Jane, on mental retardation, 58
Dyke, Frances L.: on teacher impressions and student achievement, 229; reliability of teacher reports on academic progress, 115
Eastland, James O., on racial differences, 45
Edwards, Babette, parent leader in New York City, 272, 274
Edwards, Curtis Drew: on anxiety in desegregated schools, 157; on racial attitude, 162
Edwards, Ozzie L., on black self-image, 164
Edwards, T. Bentley, on teacher preparation for desegregation, 239
Elias, M. F., 49
Elkind, David, psychologist, 65
Elliott, David Henry, on teacher attitude, 222
Elliott, Merle H., on scholastic achievement, 106
Ellis, Desmond P., study of academic expectation, 225
Emmer, Edmund, study of success expectation of minorities, 296-297

Entwisle, Doris R., psychologist: 67, 152; on inner-control and academic achievement, 143; on student self-expectation, 195

Eppes, John Williford: on black aspiration, 143 on black aspirational realism, 143

Epps, Edgar G.: on relationship of family background to academic achievement, 107; on desegregation and black anxiety, 206; on educational achievement and self-concept, 160

Erickson, Donald A., on Indian-American school control, 319

Erikson, Erik H., on black self-concept, 160

Escoffery, Aubrey Spencer, on fatalism in blacks, 146

Evans, Charles Lee: on school desegregation, 158; study of desegregated schools, 116-117, 205

Evans, Idella M., on skin color preference of Mexican-Americans, 295

Evans, Rupert N., effect of school grouping on achievement, 83

Fainstein, Susan F., on experimental community controlled schools, 274

Fanon, Franz, black psychiatrist: on Indian-American cultural identity, 314; on racial oppression caused by capitalism, 131-132

Feagin, Joe Richard, on social contact in ghetto areas, 260-261

Featherman, David L., on black socioeconomic achievement, 260

Feldman, Carol Fleischer, on study of Eskimos, 309

Feldman, David H., on ethnic patterns in intelligence, 60-61

Felice, Lawrence G., on court ordered busing, 206

Ferguson, Harold A., 101

Feurerstein, Reuven, Israeli psychologist, 64

Fichter, Joseph H., on survey of black college graduates, 138-139

Fisher, David L., on black studies program, 168

Flaugher, Ronard L., psychologist, 62

Floyd, James A., on black self-image, 164

Forten, Charlotte, author, 181

Forten, Robert B., abolitionist, 38

Fortenberry, James H., on black achievement in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma schools, 105

Franklin, John Hope, on educational expenditures in black schools, 86

Franks, Bonita B., psychologist: 67; on aspirational differences in blacks, 139

Frary, Robert B., onstudy of compensatory education for blacks, 106

Frazier, E. Franklin, sociologist, 11, 56

French, Jeana Turner, on black self-concept, 152

Frenkel, Sinai Israel, on black anxiety scores, 146-147

Friend, Ronald M., on black self-pride, 152

Frisch, Giora R., on racial self-attitudes, 161

Fruth, Marvin J., on black studies program, 168

Furby, Lita, on effect of racial preference, 166

Furst, Norma L., on teacher stereotyping, 222

Gabler, Robert, on black-white self-concept, 146

Gaines, Lloyd, Law school applicant, 30

Galamison, Milton, on community control of schools, 272

Galarza, Ernesto, Mexican-American scholar, 295

Galloway, Joel D., effect of school grouping on achievement, 83

Galvin, Robert Rogers, on bilinguality and I.Q. scores, 288

Gamboa, Erasmo, on Spanish language prohibition in schools, 295

Garcia, Hector P., on Mexican-American protests, 297

Garrett, Henry E., psychologist, 45, 46, 48

Garrison, William Lloyd, abolitionist, 129

Garth, Charles E.: on black self-concept, 155; on school preference by race, 268

Garth, Thomas R., 66

Gates, Maxine, on teacher effectiveness, 230

Gay, Geneva: study of student-teacher interaction, 232; on teacher expectation, 236

Geiger, Otis Glenn, 120

Geisel, Paul N.: 135; on black white aspirations, 135; on black self-concept, 151

Gentry, Harold W., on interracial attitudes, 188

George, W. C., on alleged intellectual inferiority of blacks, 45

Harlan, Louis R., historian, 29

Harnischfeger, Annegret, on effect of quantity of schooling on achievement, 88

Harootunian, Berj: 206; on black self-concept, 155

Harris, Albert J., on educational achievement, 101

Harris, Gary Reeves: on academic achivement, 67; on teacher attitude, 222

Harris, George, president, Amherst College, 7

Harrison, Bennett, on residential segregation, 259

Harrison, Murelle G., on pre-school racial attitudes, 188

Hartman, Alice, on educational expenditures, 87

Hauser, Robert M., on black socioeconomic achievement, 260

Hauser, Stuart T., on racial attitude, 167

Havassy, Barbara B., psychologist: 66; on inter-American differences on Spanish language tests, 289
Havighurst, Robert L.: 315; on Indian-American educational achievement, 310; on Indian-Americans, 317; on Indian-American self-concept, 314; on study of school protests, 192
Hawkes, David Thomas, on teacher employment for Indian-Americans, 220
Hawkes, Thomas H., on teacher stereotyping, 222
Heber, R., 50
Heiss, Jerold, on black self-esteem, 151
Heller, Celia S., on occupational ambitions of Mexican-American males, 293-294
Helton, William Curtis, on teacher prejudice toward blacks, 239
Henderson, Edmond: on self-concept in rural areas, 146; on teacher attitude, 223
Henderson, George: on effect of segregation on self-concept, 146; on self-concept and socioeconomic class, 139
Henderson, Norman F., on school promotion practices, 230
Henderson, Ronald Davis, on factors in school achievement, 84
Herriott, Robert E.: on educational opportunities, 133; on school discipline, 183
Herrnstein, Richard J., psychologist, 48-49
Herskovits, Melville, on heredity as basis for intelligence, 45
Hertzig, Margaret E., on cognitive learning by Puerto Ricans, 299
Heyns, Barbara Lee, effect of school grouping on achievement, 84
Hildebrandt, Charles Au, on black view of school integration, 186
Hippler, Arthur, study in California, 66
Hirsch, Jay G., on cognitive potential of blacks, 67
Hobart, C. W., on policies toward Eskimos, 313
Hodgkins, Benjamin J., on effect of segregation on self-concept, 146
Hoetker, James, on study of racial attitudes, 163
Hollingsworth, Leta, 43
Hollister, Clifton D., on parent-school relations in Detroit, Michigan, 268
Holmes, Hamilton, on college racial isolation, 199-200
Horowitz, Frances Degan, on racial prejudice, 167
Houmes, Gary Alan, on study of racial disruption in schools, 192
Houston, Charles H., lawyer, 30
Howe, Frederick Charles, on achievement expectancy, 230
Howe, Harold, II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, 23
Howell, William Lawrence, on effect of school desegregation on academic achievement, 120
Hraba, Joseph, on racial self-awareness, 164
Hsia, Jayjia, on desegregation, 235
Hubert, Kenneth W., on Indian ethnic preference, 316
Hughes, Langston, poet, 8
Hunigan, Wendel J., on black studies program, 168
Hunt, David E., on desegregation study, 206
Hunter, Charlayne, on college racial isolation, 199
Huson, Carolyn F., on vocational records of black college graduates, 138
Hutchins, Edwin B.: on black self-esteem, 151; on educational aspirations, 141

Irvine, S. H., psychologist, 61
Israel, Benjamin L., on teacher expectation and student academic achievement, 229
Jackson, Anne Mae, psychologist, 68
Jackson, Ellen, black leader in Boston, 184
Jacobson, Cardell Klaine, on black self-concept, 152
Jacobson, Lenore, on teacher expectation, 236
Jacoby, Susan, on academic achievement and community controlled schools, 277
James, Doyle Hill, on desegregation and self-esteem, 158
Janney, Fred, on black social conformity, 185
Jefferson, Thomas, against intellectual equality, 37
Jencks, Christopher, sociologist, 79
Jensen, Arthur R.: on cognitive learning skills, 65; criticism of, 48-49; on intelligence studies, 47-48; psychologist, 50
Jensen, Joyce, on Indian-American I.Q. scores, 309
Jensen, Mary, on teacher-student interaction, 229
Johnson, Douglas, 58
Johnson, Eugene B., on teacher influence, 234
Johnson, Norman J., on black academic adequacy, 197-199
Jones, Clarice, on social class and racial attitude, 188
Jones, James D., on school tracking, 220
Jonsson, Harold A., on effect of busing on racial attitudes, 183
Jorgensen, Carl Christian: on black self-image, 152; on personal control and academic achievement, 143-144

Jourdain, Roger, Indian-American, 317
Jurs, Stephen G., on school busing in Denver Colorado, 121-122

Kaalberg, Ramona M., on racial interaction, 189
Kagan, Jerome, on minority education, 77
Kaplan, Henry K.: on school desegregation and prejudice, 268; on sociometric testing, 185
Kariger, Roger Hugh, 83
Katz, Daniel, on cademic self-confidence 141
Kuhh, Kenneth Chester, on black self-concept and desegregation, 158
Kurtz, Harold, on desegregation study, 266
Ladd, Carl E., on Indian-American academic achievement, 310
Ladner, Joyce Ann, sociologist, 66
Laing, Donald S., on racial isolation and school busing, 207
Landers, Jacob: on educational achievement, 101; on per pupil expenditures, 87
Larsen, Mary Juhan, on factors influencing intelligence, 61
Laurent, James Arthur, on desegregation in education, 102
Layden, Russell Glenn, on effect of language instruction of Puerto Ricans, 300
Lee, Frank E., on study of racial interaction, 183
Leifer, Anna, on cultural influences on intelligence, 62
Lesser, Gerald S.: on academic achievement by minorities, 106; on intelligence scores, 59-60
Lessing, Elsie E., on self-concept and academic achievement, 149
Levin, Joel R., on interraciality and desegregation, 209
Levy, Marilyn, on study of Project Concern, 111
Lewontin, Richard D., geneticist, 50
Lillienstein, Ernest, on study of school boycotts, 258-259
Linton, Thomas H., on Mexican-American self-concept, 294
Lipton, Aaron: on self-image in interracial settings, 152; on school desegregation, 194
Lockhart, Lillie Marie, on school violence, 192-193
Lockwood, Jane D.: on desegregation and self-esteem, 150; on effect of desegregation on black educational achievement, 105
Lohman, Mark R., on desegregated education, 195
Long, Barbara: on self-concept in rural areas, 146; on teacher attitude, 223
Long, David, effect on school achievement of desegregation, 105
Long, Howard H., psychologist: 44; on educational achievement, 101; on relationship of school facilities to achievement, 101
Lopez, Josephine, on Mexican-American cultural identity, 293
Lopez, Richard Emilio, on skin color preference of Mexican-American college students, 295-296
Lorenz, Gerta, on effect of social class on aspiration, 144
Lovinger, Robert J., on educational achievement, 101
Lugo, James Oscar, study of Mexican-American cultural identity, 296
Luszki, Margaret B., on black school performance, 268

McAdoo, Hariette Ann, on racial attitude and self-image, 164
McAdoo, John Lewis, on racial attitudes, 164
McAllister, Jane Ellen, first black woman to obtain doctorate in education, 130
McArdle, Clare G., on black racial identity, 147
McCollough, James S., 120
McCoy, Rhode Arnold, school administrator, 274-275
McDill, Edward L.: on effect of parental interest on academic achievement, 269; on school desegregation, 207
McDowell, Sophia Fagan, on racial interaction, 187-188
McGlamery, C. Donald, on social interaction, 198
McMillan, Joseph Howard, on teacher influence, 238
McPartland, James, sociologist: 108; on black academic achievement, 188; on school desegregation and academic achievement, 103-104
McPherson, D. Angus, on segregation and racial attitudes, 162
McWhirt, Ronald Alfred: on desegregation and interracial contact, 206; on desegregation and self-esteem, 156
McWorter, Gerald A., on study of school boycotts, 258
Macdonald, Peter, leader of Navajo Indians, 320
Mackler, Bernard, psychologist: 68; effect of school grouping on achievement, 83
MacMillan, Robert Wilson, on socioeconomic factors in educational achievement, 291
Maeher, Martin L., on teacher expectation, 236-237

Mahan, Aline H.: on school desegregation, 159; on study of inner city children in suburban schools, 111
Mahan, Thomas W.: on school desegregation, 159; on study of inner city children in suburban schools, 111
Maliver, Bruce L., on anti-black bias among blacks, 147
Malry, Lenton, on aspirations in Mexican-Americans, 293
Manning, Jean Ball, on self-concept, 150
Marascuilo, Leonard A., on social integration and segregation, 209-210
Marcum, Roger Brasel, on effect of desegregation in Illinois, 120
Marjoribanks, Kevin, on ethnic influences on cognition, 62-64
Markley, Oliver Wendell, on selection of college roommates, 198
Marshall, Thurgood, equates racism with separate but equal doctrine, 21
Martin, Harold P., 49
Martinez-Monfort, Antonio, on racial attitude and desegregation, 188
Matkom, Anthony J.: on sociometric testing, 185; on school desegregation and prejudice, 268
Matthews, Robert L., on black studies, 160
Matzen, Stanley P., on educational achievement, 102-103
Marx, Gary T., on black opinion of Americanism, 248-249
Marx, Ronald W., on relationship of self-concept to academic achievement, 140
Mayer, Robert R., on student-teacher interaction, 231
Mayeske, George W., 79, 81
Mayo, Clara, 184
Mayo, Marian Jacob, 101
Meeks, Donald E., study of black aspiration, 137
Meketon, Betty F.: 148; on impact of desegregation on black self-esteem, 155
Meltzer, Bert, on voluntary school busing, 210
Meltzer, Carole Ganner, on empathetic behavior, 165
Mendel, Gregor, geneticist, 39
Mercer, Jane R.: on desegregation and discipline, 234, on effect of desegregation on educational achievement, 119; on mental retardation, 59-60; on school desegregation and racial composition of schools, 266
Meyers, Edmund Dean, on effect of social climate in schools, 82
Meyers, Edna O.: on educational achievement, 66; effect of black achievement and family structure, 268
Mezz, Sheila Meyers, on black studies program, 167
Michael, William L., 58
Michelson, Stephen, economist, 75, 81
Miiler, Gordon W., on factors in school achievement, 81
Miller, Harold J., on Indian-American integration, 316
Miller, LaMar Perry, on black self-esteem, 150
Miller, Max Donald, on ethnic patterns in intelligence scores, 62
Miller, Norman: on benefits of school desegregation, 132; on desegregation study in Riverside, California, 118; on teacher bias, 234
Mock, Ronald Lester, on black conformity, 185-186
Mondale, Walter F., Senator, 285
Moody, Charles David, on employment of black school administrators, 220
Moore, Louise, on academic achievement in Georgia and Virginia, 121
Moore, William: on study of ghetto conditions, 261; on study of ghetto area, 260-261
Moorfield, Thomas Earl, on effect of busing in Missouri schools, 121; on school busing, 211
Moreno, Marguerite Cusak: effect of integration on school achievement, 116; on effects of integration, 208
Moreno, Steve, on I.Q. testing of bilingual students, 289
Morland, J. Kenneth, on racial awareness, 163
Morris, Charles F., on North Carolina desegregation study, 203-204
Morris, Joseph, on school desegregation, 157
Morse, Richard J.: 196; on black self-concept, 155
Muhammad, Elijah, leader of Black Muslims, 261
Muir, Donald E., on social integration, 198
Muldrow, Tressie W., on racial personality traits, 162
Muller, H. J., intelligence studies on twins, 42
Mumford, Luther, on study of desegregation, 265-266

Nam, Charles B., on educational opportunities, 133
Narot, Ruth E.: on impact of desegregation on white students, 120; on school participation by blacks, 201
Neale, John M., on black self-pride, 152

Nelson, Edward A., on student views on student-teacher interaction, 227-228
Newton, Huey, Black Panther leader, 192
Nichols, Paul L., psychologist, 57
Noel, Donald L., on ethnic consciousness, 163
Nowak, William Stanley, on voluntary busing, 211
Noyola, Arnoldo Jaime, on Mexican-American education, 290

Oakland, Thomas, study of success expectation of minorities, 296-297
Oberg, Hjordis G., on effect of teacher race, 238
O'Connor, Andrew Lewis, on black conformity in schools, 186
Odell, William R., on educational aspirations in Philadelphia, Pa. schools, 138
Offenbacher, Deborah, psychologist, 68
Ogbu, John U.: 222; ethnography of education, 85-86
Olds, Morris Eugene, on teacher reactions to faculty desegregation, 221
Olexa, Carol, on school grouping achievement, 84
Olmstead, Patricia, psychologist, 67
O'Neill, Elizabeth Ford Stone, on acculturation in Mexican-American children, 291
Oppenheim, Don B., on racial identification, 160
Ortiz, Alfonso, on Indian-American education, 320
Owens, Susan, on black self-esteem, 151
Owens, Thomas R., on Chicano self-concept, 294

Palmer, Edward L., on racial preference, 166
Palomares, Geraldine Dunn, on Chicano self-concept, 295
Parsons, Theodore W., on study of Mexican-Americans, 225-226
Passow, A. Harry, on opinion survey in Washington, D.C., 240-241
Patchen, Martin, on racial interaction, 189-190
Payne, Joseph F., on minority reading levels, 290
Pecoraro, Joseph, on Indian-American self-concept, 315
Peele, Stanton, on effect of segregation on black motivation, 140
Personke, Carl R., on I.Q. testing of Mexican-American children, 237
Peterson, Joseph, psychologist, 44
Pettigrew, Thomas F.: on parent involvement in schools, 277-278; on public opinion on school desegregation, 248; on study of desegregation and prejudice, 263-264
Phillips, W. M., on black participation in schools, 270-271
Piaget, Jean, psychologist, 62
Pitts, James P., on racial behavior, 193
Plakos, John, on Spanish editions of I.Q. tests and mental retardation, 288
Platoff, Joan C., on study of mothers of preschoolers, 269
Plaut, Richard L., 101
Plotkin, Lawrence: on black academic records, 196-207; on racial discrimination in colleges, 183
Polier, Justine Wise, Skipwith Case, 26
Porter, Judith D., on racial preference, 165
Posner, Carmen A., on effect of social class on self-concept, 149-150
Powell, Alice Mendham, on pre-school racial awareness, 161
Powell, Christus N.: 136; on black aspirations in Alabama, 136
Powell, Gloria Johnson: on black self-concept, 154; on school desegregation, 157
Powers, Jerry M., on black self-image, 152
Prichard, Paul N.: on effects of desegregation in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 120; on parent participation after school desegregation, 269
Pugh, Roderick W., on study of black students, 185
Purdy, Joseph Donald: 315; on learning skills of Indian-Americans, 310
Purl, Mabel C.: 233-234; on school desegregation studies, 118

Quarles, Benjamin, on education, 245

Radin, Norma, on test performances of blacks, 105
Radke, Marion: on study of racial interaction, 186; on racial identity, 160
Raffel, Jeffrey A., on school participation by ethnic groups, 269-270
Rafky, David M., on black faculty at white colleges, 239
Ramirez, Arnulfo G., on effect of bilingual instruction, 291
Randquist, Bobby Wayne, on Indian-American education, 318
Rayson, Harvey, on anxiety levels in desegregated schools, 158
Reiss, Elizabeth Waldkotter, psychologist, 62
Rhodes, Albert Lewis: on educational opportunities, 133; on parental expectations and educational plans, 141
Richmond, Bert O.: on black self-concept, 147; on school creativity, 69

Richmond, David M. H., on educational aspirations of blacks, 144
Riessman, Frank, on black school participation, 267
Risley, Todd R., on racial preference study, 166
Ritterband, Paul, on school violence, 193
Rivera, Ramon J., on study of school boycotts, 258
Rivers, Larry Wendell, on intelligence testing, 61
Robeson, Paul, as student at Rutgers University, 1915, 7
Robin, Stanley, on school desegregation and white flight, 266
Roche, Richard J., 8
Rock, Donald A., psychologist, 62
Rock, John, black leader, 38
Rodgers, Frederick A., psychologist, 68
Rodman, Hyman, on social class and aspirations, 139
Rodriguez, Clara, on ethnic affinity in Puerto Ricans, 300

Samuels, Joseph Maurice, on Project Concern, 111
Samuels, Shirley C., on effect of social class on self-concept, 154
Sanchez, Armand J., on Mexican-American self-concept, 293
Sanders, J. T., psychologist, 61
Sartain, James A., on school desegregation and prejudice, 268
Sarthory, Joseph A., on ability grouping and minority educational achievement, 292
Sattler, Jerome M., 58
Sawhill, Lucy M., on busing in Seattle, Washington, 121
Scarlett, Frank M., judge, 46
Schafer, Walter E., on school grouping and achievement, 84
Schenk, M. R. S., psychologist, 42
Schiltz, Michael E., on vocational records of black college graduates, 138
Schlesinger, Ina: on desegregation study, 208; on teacher prejudice, 235
Schmidt, Marilyn, on teacher attitude, 222
Schmuck, Richard, on black school performance, 268
Schneider, Frank Wheeler, on effect of racism in education, 186
Schneider, Jeffrey Michael, psychologist: 19; on effect of segregation on self-concept, 147
Schwartz, Henrietta, on Indian-American school control, 319
Scott, John C., on study of Alaskan Indians, 313
Scott, Ralph: 57; on social class and reading readiness, 106
Scott, Wayne, on effect of busing on academic achievement, 112-113
Schudder, Bonnie Todd, on busing in Denver, Colorado, 123-124
Seda Bonilla, Eduardo, on racial background in education, 77
Segal, Phyllis: on role of teacher, 232-233; on school desegregation, 202-203; on school desegregation and prejudice, 268
Shaheen, Thomas, school administrator, 221
Shannon, John Howard, psychologist, 59
Sharon, Amiel T., on racial differences in newspaper readership, 261
Shaw, Marvin E., on desegregation and self-esteem, 158
Shedd, Mark, school administrator, 221
Shuey, Audrey M., 49
Siberstein, Richard, on school violence, 193
Siegel, Gary, on study of racial attitudes, 163
Sierra Rodriquez, Valerio, on Mexican-American self-concept, 294
Sigel, Irving E., psychologist, 67
Simmons, Roberta G., on self-esteem, in Baltimore, Maryland schools, 153
Singer, Dorothy G.: on effect of interracial attitudes on self-concept, 148; on racial identity, 163, 203
Singh, Surendra Pratap, on school creativity, 68
Sitkei, Emil George, on intelligence testing, 61
Slone, Irene Wholl, of effect on pairing on achievement, 113
Smith, D. B., on intelligence test scores in Job Corps, 60
Smith, Eddie D., on teacher attitude, 223
Smith, James E., 57
Smith, James McCune, physician, 38
Smith, Merle Edward, on black studies program, 168
Smith, Ralph V.: on social interaction in ghetto area, 260; study of integration in Detroit, Michigan, 139
Smith, Waldron, on teacher attitude toward Indian-Americans, 317
Smith, William F., on social interaction and desegregation, 188
Soares, Anthony T., on self-concept, 150
Soares, Louis M., on self-concept, 150
Solkoff, Norman, 58
Solomon, Daniel, psychologist, 67
Spellman, Judith B., on teacher attitude, 223

Spencer, Margaret Besle, on racial prejudice, 167
Spiegel, John P., on study of civic violence due to school desegregation, 250
Spilka, Bernard: on Indian-Americans, 316; on Indian-American educational achievement, 312
Spottswood, Robinson, Legal Defense Fund attorney, 21
Spurlock, Jeanne, on black self-concept, 167
Stabler, John R., on pre-school racial attitudes, 161
Stakenas, Robert G., on effect on segregation on self-concept, 146
Stapleton, Jack L., on effect of teacher on race awareness, 164
Starnes, Thomas Albert, on academic achievement in desegregated schools, 157
Steigelmann, Val Victor, on racial identity, 165
Stewart, Lawrence H., on intelligence testing in Hawaii, 60
Stinson, Harold N., on effect of desegregation on self-esteem, 156
Stodolsky, Susan S., on intelligence scores, 61
Stokes, Charles Alphonso, psychologist, 62
Stones, Michael E., on racial attitudes of school principals, 221
Strain, Barbara, on racial identity, 164
Straley, Henry Goff, on study of school transportation in West Virginia, 109
Strang, William Jacob, on black self-concept, 153
Sulzer, Jefferson L., 49
Szasz, Margaret, on Indian-American education, 307-309

Taylor, Charlotte P., on effect of desegregation on self-esteem, 156
Taylor, William L., testified on Northern desegregation cases, 1961-1972, 28
Teele, James E., on voluntary busing in Boston, Mass., 122
Tefft, Stanton K., on interraciality of Indian-Americans, 314
Terman, Lewis, devised intelligence test, 1916, 41
Thomas, Alexander, on Puerto Rican intellectual development, 299
Thomas, Charles Richard, on busing and school desegregation, 252-253
Thomas, Cleveland A., on racial interaction, 183
Thomas, Robert K., on Indian-American self-determination, 320
Thomas, W. I., sociologist, 39
Thompson, A.C.C., commendator, 129
Thompson, Carolyn E.: on teacher-impressions and student achievement, 229; reliability of teacher reports on academic progress, 115
Thompson, Charles H., Black editor, 43-44
Thorndike, E. L., on hereditary basis of intelligence, 41
Thorp, Claiburne Burnice, on aspirational levels and social class, 140
Thrane, Vidkuhn Coucheron, Norwegian psychologist, 64
Trent, Richard D., on self-concept and racial attitude, 146
Trimble, Joseph E., on study of Indian-Americans, 312
Trowbridge, Norma, on self-concept and socio-economic class, 151
Tuckman, Bruce W., on teacher expectation, 237
Tulkin, Steven R., psychologist, 69
Turner, Jonathan H., on academic achievement in rural South Carolina, 86

Uhl, Norman P., on student-teacher interaction, 227-228
Uhlman, Thomas N., on study of school desegregation, 265
Underwood, Jerald Ross, on Indian-Americans, 313
Urbom, Warren, K., U.S. District Judge, 308
Useem, Elizabeth Livingston, on voluntary school busing, 210

Valenzuela, Alvero Miguel, on Chicano self-concept, 294
Vane, Julia R., on effect of desegregation on school achievement, 105
Vasquez, James, on cultural bias of I.Q. tests, 289
Veblen, Thorstein, economist, 97
Veron, P., psychologist, 49
Veroff, Joseph, on effect of segregation on black motivation, 140
Vincent, David, education of blacks in Memphis, Tennessee, 87
Visscher, Sietwende Hermberg, on Indian-American self-concept, 315
Vogler, James Donald, on effect of ethnicity on pictorial test ofintelligence, 288
Volkman, Jacob, on parent participation in education, 66
Voydanoff, Patricia, on social class and aspirations, 139
Vredevoe, Lawrence E., on school desegregation and discipline, 183

Walberg, Herbert, J.: on educational expenditures, 87; on voluntary busing in Boston, Mass., 122
Walker, Jack L., on school desegregation survey in Detroit, Michigan, 254
Walker, Kenneth DeLeon, on self-esteem and desegregation, 157
Walker, Olive, psychologist, 69
Ward, Susan Harris, on racial preference, 166
Wash, Brenda Dolores Lakin, on black self-concept, 153
Weshburn, Sherwood L., on intelligence quotient testing, 60
Waugh, John T., ex-slave, 2
Wax, Murray L., on study of Indian-Americans, 317
Wayson, William N., on teacher attitudes in ghetto, 268
Webster, Murray, on student self-expectation, 185-186
Webster, Staten W.: on effects on interracial contacts, 172-173; on racial attitudes, 172-173
Weddington, Rachel T., on influence of social class on stereotyping, 136
Weinman, Janice Jenny, on school control by Indian-Americans, 319
Weisman, Carol Sachs, on integration and academic achievement, 102
Weiss, Leonard, on black income levels, 260.
Weissbach, Theodore S., on self-concept development in pre-schools, 147
Weissman, Julius, on minority communication between children and mothers, 299
Welsing, Frances Cress, on black self-image, 130
Wendland, Marilyn Marie, on black self-concept, 145-156
Werner, Emmy E., on intelligence testing in Hawaii, 60
Werner, Norma A., on skin color preference of Mexican-Americans, 295
Wessman, Alden, on evaluation of project ABC, educational, 140; on self-concept studies, 131
White, Agatha E.: on public opinion survey of black community, 139; on school desegregation study, 248
White, Danny Allen, on academic achievement and school busing, 109
White, Kinnard, on desire to attend college in desegregated schools, 145
White, William F., on black self-concept, 147
Wiggins, James W., study of academic expectation, 225
Wilcox, Preston W., on teacher attitudes in ghetto, 221
Wiley, David E., on effect of quantity of schooling on achievement, 88
Williams, Frank E., on study of school desegregation, 111
Williams, John E., on racial attitude, 162
Williams, Joyce H., on racial interaction, 205
Williams, Robert B., on busing in Seattle, Washington, 121
Williams, Robert L.: on desegregation and self-esteem, 159; on school integration, 185
Williams, Robin M., on study of racial attitude, 182
Williamson, Jeffrey G., on black income levels, 260
Willie, Charles V.: 221, on racial interaction, 207-208
Wilson, Alan B.: on effect of integration on black students, 108; on effect of segregation upon aspirations, 134-135
Wilson, Charles, school administrator, 275
Winkler, Donald R., on effect of schools on achievement, 80, 81, 84
Winne, Philip H., on self-concept and academic achivement, 148
Winther, Sven F., on college performance of Spanish-surname students, 292
Wise, James H., on racial awareness, 162
Withycombe, Jeraldine Smith, on Indian-American self-concept, 314
Witty, Paul A.: comparative study of educational achievement, 101; on Negro intelligence, 43
Wolman, T. G., effect on integration on learning, 113
Wood, Judge, 18
Woodenlegs, John, Indian-American leader, 317
Woodward, Jane W., on racial self-segregation, 204
Worcester, Everett, on student protects, 192
Wright, Richard, author, 130
Wylie, Ruth C.; on black self-concept, 150; on educational aspirations, 131 on self-concept studies, 122

SUBJECT INDEX

ABC: *see* Project "A Better Chance"
ACT Test: *see* American College Testing Program
ADC: *see* Aid to Dependent Children
AFDC: *see* Aid to Families and Dependent Children
AIM: *see* American Missionary Association
Ability Test Scores, Chicano, effect of language differences on, 289-290
Abolitionists, 245
Academic Failure: effect of teachers on, 220-240; theory of cultural deprivation in, 222
Achievement Studies: *see* Educational Achivement
Achievement Tests: *see* Scholastic Achievement Tests
Achievement Test Scores: *see* Scholastic Achievement Test Scores
Aid to Dependent Children, 141; reading levels of recipients, 290
Aid to Families and Dependent Children, 141
Akwesasne Notes, 319
Alabama:
  Alba, violence in, 202
  Birmingham: survey of black public opinion in, 249; effect of school desegregation on teachers and principals, 219-220
  Mobile County, desegregation studies, 158
  Montgomery: bus boycott in 1955, 246; integration study, 163; openenrollment in schools, 248; school desegregation opinion survey, 248; school desegregation studies, 202, 261; study of school desegregation, 187; survey of black public opinion, 249
Alaska: Indians in, 316; Indians excluded from public schooling, 308; Juneau, achievement scores of Indians in, 300; Tlinget Indians in, 301
Alexander Case: *see* Table of Cases
Alpha Test: *see* Intelligence Quotient Tests: Standardized
American College Testing Program, 199
American Council of Education, study, 32
American Educational Research Association, 48
American Indian Movement, 307-308
Colgate Rochester Divinity School, quota system, 8
College(s): Administration policies, 8-9; black awareness at, 199-206; black racial isolation in, 198-200; in Georgia, 188-1882, 7; interracial relations in, 196-200; quota systems, 187; racial attitudes on roommate selection, 198; social integration in 198-200; Southern, racial interaction in, 198; Southern, racial violence in, 198; Spanish-surname drop-outs in, 292; state appropriations, under 2nd Morrill Act 1890, 7; studies of faculty-student interaction, 238-239
  Black: graduates prior to 1900, 7; land grant colleges, 7; 29-30; Morrill Act 1862, 1890, 7; standards of personal conduct in, 8
  Black Enrollment: as day students only, 8; exclusion from medical and engineering programs, 8; in college preparatory courses, 7; in North, 1915-1945, 8; Ohio State University, 9; white enrollment, 31
  Black Faculty: discrimination, 31; percentage, 1972-1973, 31
College Completion: by Anglo-Americans, 290; by blacks, 290; by Mexican-Americans, 290
College Enrollment, Indian-Americans, 322
College Entrance Examination Board, 44
College Fraternities, 198
College Preparation, black, 196-200
College Sororities: 198; black, interaction with whites, 197; black, members high school background in, 197
Colleges and Universities:
  Black: college accreditation, 1920's, 8; college endowment, 1925, 8; college enrollment, 10; educational background of entering students, 10; educational opportunities, 8-10;

educational standards, 1920's, 8; enrollment, 1910-1930, 7; enrollment, 1970, 11; Hampton Institute, 8; in South, since 1945, 10; Tuskegee Institute, 8
In North: black employment in, 9, 11; non-white enrollment, 179 percent high school graduates entering college, 1963-1968, 11; white enrollment, 10
Color Line: *see* Schools: segregated
Colorado, Denver: School board enforced segregation, 180; school desegregation study, 120-121; study on black pride, 168
Common Schools: *see* Schools: Public
Communication Patterns: black, between parent and child, 288; Puerto-Rican, between parent and child, 288
Community Action, on school desegregation, 256-264
Community Controlled Schools: *see* Schools: Community Controlled
Community School Board, New York, N.Y., 276
Educational Financing: Indian-American education, 208; Indian-American schools, 310
Educational Opportunities: affected by school desegregation, 330-331; for Mexican-Americans, 246-262
Educational Quality Tests: Ayres Test, 42-43
Educational Studies of Mexican-American, Puerto Rican and Spanish-speaking students, 285-301
Educational Theories: 327
Emanicipation Bill: required complusory black education, 17
Emergency School Aid Act, 328
Emergency School Assistance Program, 328, 108-109, 200
Emergency Substitute Teaching Position, 86
Empathy: *see* Racial Empathy
Employment; black, effect of educational achievement on, 133
Eskimo: education, 313-314; cognitive skills in, 309; excluded from public schooling in Alaska, 308; foreign government educational policies toward, 313; Greenlandic, 313
Ethnic Consciousness, 163
Ethnic Identification; 160; black 166; Mexican-Americans, 166
Ethnic Minorities: U.S. Supreme Court decisions affecting, 286-287
Ethnic Preference: Indian-Americans, 316
Ethnic Queue: *see* Puerto Rican: ethnic affinity
Ethnic Studies Programs, 192
Evanston Township High School, Illinois, 138
Evolution, theory of, as basis for racism, 38
Extracurricular Activities: *see* School(s): Extra curricular activities
Faculty, black, relationship to white students, 238-239
Federal Executive Orders: *see* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office for Civil Rights
Federal Indian Laws, 307-309
Federal Land Grants: as means of financing education, 2; to Southern states, 2
Federal Voting Rights Act, 1965, 249
Florida: black self-concept studies in, 155; county-wide school districts in, 278; desegregation studies, 157, 206; effect of school desegregation in 97-100; study of racial disorders in schools, 192; study of school desegregation, 266-267
Brevard County, study of desegregation in, 110
Dade County: achievement study after desegregation, 110; desegregation studies, 157; school desegregation study, 204-205
Daytona Beach, study of black conformity in, 186
Gainesville: black political power in, 259; study of school conformity in, 186
Leon County, desegregation studies, 157
Manatee County, desegregation studies, 157
Miami, court-ordered faculty desegregation, 233
Pensacola, actions of political pressure in,
Volusia County, study of school busing in, 108
Food Rations, denied to Indian-Americans, 308
Free Choice Enrollment: *see* Schools: Open Enrollment
Free Negro: 1; attendance in public schools, 1860, 1; geographic mobility of, 1860, 1; population in South, 1860, 1
Freedmens Bureau: educational activities of, 3
Fund for Negro Students, 195
HES; *see* High Exposure School
HEW: *see* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Hampton Institute, 8
Hardy Junior High School, Chattanooga, Tennessee 189
Harris Opinion Research Survey, 246-247

Harvard University, Center for Law and Education, 307
Head Start Programs, 49, 67, 161, 230, 295
Heredity: as basis of intelligence, 41; as determined by genetics, 47; as factor intelligence, 47
Heritability Ratios, 47
Higher Education, black: academic achievement records, 196-200; at Amherst College, 7; availability of facilities for graduate studies, 10; black graduate studies, 10; college drop-out rate, 11; college endowments for, 10; college enrollment in, 10-11; college point averages, 187; college graduates, 10; college graduates, 1876-1900, 7; degrees conferred, 10; discrimination in college housing, 9; enrollment in black colleges, 9-10; enrollment in community colleges, 11; enrollment in graduate schools, 10; enrollment in predominantly white colleges, 10; enrollment in white colleges, 11; expenditures for in South, 10; federal grants to, 10; female graduates prior to World War I, 7; financial aid to students, 11; graduates from black colleges prior to World War I, 7; interracial relations in, 186-190; in North prior to 1910, 7; in North, since 1945, 11; number of entering students in, 11; at Oberlin College, 6-7; per pupil expenditures for, 10; quota system in, 10; racial discrimination in, 11; social discrimination in, 10; in South, since 1945, 10
High Exposure School, interracial attitudes in, 140-141
High School: grade point averages, black, 197-198; grade point averages, white, 197-198
Housing, integrated, effect on black self-concept, 140
Howard University, 162
Human Relations Club, Oak Park, Illinois, 184
Human Rights: *see* Civil Rights
Intelligence Quotient Test Scores, 185, effect of desegregation on, 46; effect of language proficiency on, 67; effect of socioeconomic conditions on, 66-67; in Los Angeles, California, 1969, 69; as predictors of academic achievement, 67; reflecting cognitive skills, 67; result of giving test in native language, 287-288; results of language differences on Mexican-Amercians on, 287-288; verbal, 109; vocabulary, 109
    Blacks; 67-71; black-white gap, 66-68; effect of school desegregation on, 111, 121
    Indian-Americans 212-213
    Mexican-Americans, effect of family size on, 294
    Puerto Rican, comparison to mainland white, 288
Intelligence Tests: *see* Intelligence Quotient Tests
International Association for Evaluation of Educational Achievement, 78-79
Interracial Advisory Committees, 259
Interracial Attitudes: *see also* Racial Attitudes; in desegregated schools, 148-149; in segregated schools, 148-154; tests of, 148
Interracial Contact, in urban areas, 260-264
Interracial Friendships, role of school desegregation on, 199
Interracial Friendships, role of school desegregation on, 199
Interracial Studies, 224-237
Interraciality: *see also* School Desegregation; in public schools, 328 effect of black economic level on, 261; effect on black self-concept, 148-154
LDF: *see* National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Legal Defense Fund
LES: *see* Low Exposure School
Lamarckianism, theory of race development, 38
Language Deficiencies: as factors in Puerto Rican scores on achievement tests, 287; of Spanish-Americans, 285; Puerto Rican, 287
Language Differences: as factor in minority learning, 328; of Mexican-Americans and effect on I.Q. scores, 287-289
Latinos: *see also* Mexican-Americans; *see also* Puerto Ricans, 289; attitudes of success expectations in, 194
Law Schools, Minority Enrollment in, 309
Lawsuits, brought by blacks for quality education, 245
Learning Abilities: black, 77-89; effect of school environment on 79-81; effect of socioeconomic level on, 77-89; influence of curricula on, 78; minorities, 78-89
Learning Possibilities, black, 55-71
Learning Theories, 77-89
Lewis Case, *see* Table of Cases
Liberator, published by William Lloyd Garrison, 129
Lincoln High School, San Diego, California, 169
Lincoln University, racial discrimination at, 31
Literacy Requirements; as barrier to specific occupations, 1; in apprenticeship programs, 1; under apprenticeship laws, 17-18
Louisiana: Baton Rouge, desegregation study, 188; desegregation study, 201; effect of school desegregation in, 219; study of faculty desegregation, 233

Louisiana Purchase, effect on free blacks' education, 2
Low Exposure School, interracial attitudes in, 148-149
Low *n* Ach, *see* Cultural Values: Spanish-Speaking, motivation to achieve Intelligence Quotient Scores in, 291; interaction with Indian-Americans, 311; learning ability, 286-301; learning ability compared to Anglo-Americans, 291; migrancy patterns in, 286-287; migrant farm workers, 286-287; presumed intellectual inferiority of, 287-288; racial definition of, 286; representation on school policy levels, 286-287
Mexican Culture, denigration by schools in Southwest, 286
Mexico, territorial losses to United States, 286
Migrant Farm Workers, *see* Mexican-Americans
Michigan: racial self-awareness study, 164; school desegregation study in 184; study of racial preferences in, 168
    Ann Arbor, effect of busing on academic achievement in, 112
    Detroit: black support of education in, 267; black views on school desegregation in, 248; segregation study in, 149; study of Indian-Americans in, 314; study of Indian-American achievement in 313; study of parent-school relationship in 268; study of racial self-attitude, 165-166; study of social interaction in ghetto in, 260; Central High School, 156-157; Pershing High School, 156-157
    Flint, classroom study in, 226
    Grand Rapids, a study of effect of busing on academic achievement, 111-112
    Jackson, study of social interaction on achievement, 112
    Kalamazoo; effect of court ordered busing in, 211; school desegregation study in, 266; study of desegregation and teacher preference, 235
    Pontiac: school desegregation study in 256; study of black pride in, 168
    Ypsilanti: desegregation study in, 149; study of racial balance in schools, 104
Michigan State University: study of racial discrimination at, 79; study of social factors in schools in, 82
Militance-of-Action Index, 251
Millikin University, racial-discrimination at, 198
Minnesota: studies of Indian-Americans in, 307-308; Minneapolis, study of Indian-Americans, 214-317; Red Lake, Indian Tribal Council in, 317
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory: *see* Personality Tests
Minoritity Groups, ethnic identification in, 327
Mississippi: racial interaction study in parochial schools, 189; school desegregation studies in, 265-266
    Gulfport, study of black education in, 107-108
Missouri, Kansas City: 211; school desegregation studies in, 120
    St. Louis: black representation on educational staff, 238; ghetto conditions in, 261; study of ghetto areas in, 260; study of racial self-concept in, 163
    University City, study of self-image in, 114-115
Newsweek Poll, 261
New York:
    Buffalo: desegregation studies, 113; school desegregation study in, 114, 206-207
    Hartsdale, study of racial interaction, 184
    Manhasset, study of effect of desegregation in, 112-113
    Manhattan, racial interaction study in, 185-186
    Monroe County, effect of busing in, 113
    New Rochelle, desegregation study in, 112
    New York: black protests against school boards, 271; black representation in school administration, 238; Bedford Stuyvesant, 252; community school control by blacks, 277-278; desegregation studies in 206-208; ethnic identity studies in, 166-167; experimental school districts in, 277-278; Puerto Rican school enrollment in, 1956-1965, 287; racial identity studies in, 160; school disorders, 1968-1969, 193, studies of Puerto Ricans in, 287-289; study of open-enrollment in, 228-229; study of racial attitudes in, 181; study of racial attitudes in schools in, 228; study of teacher attitude toward desegregation in, 228
    Rochester: desegregation studies in, 207; study of racial self-identification in, 168; voluntary in, 229
    State: Board of Regents, 27; school behavior problems in, 223
    Syracuse, desegregation studies in, 112
    White Plains: desegregation study in 113-114

New York Globe, black newspaper, 245, 271
New York State Commission on Education: closed all black schools, 1943, 26
North Carolina: desegregation studies in, 203-204; racial awareness study in, 162; school desegregation studies in, 119; study of school desegregation in, 1967-1968, 265; teacher expectation study in, 237
    Central University (Durham), racial violence at, 227
    Chapel Hill: academic expectation study, 225; school desegregation studies in, 119; study of black separatism in, 238; study of parental participation after school desegregation, 269
    Charlotte: school desegregation study in, 231; study of school policies under desegregation, 203
    Goldsboro: desegregation study in, 203; school desegregation studies in, 119; study of teacher-student interaction in, 231-232
    Hanover County, school desegregation studies in, 119
    Winston-Salem: desegregation study in 203-204; racial identity study in, 162
North Dakota, study of Indian-Americans in, 316
Northwestern High School, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 204
Northwestern University, racial protest at, 198
OCR: *see* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights
O.E.: *see* Schools, open-enrollment programs
OH-B: *see* Schools, experimental, Ocean Hill, New York and Brownsville, New York
Oak Park High School, Detroit, Michigan, 184-185
Oakwood College, 146
Slave Revolts, and resulting legal actions, 17
Slavery: 245; and black self-concept, 129-130; education during, 37; effect on aspiration and achievement, 130-132; in 1700's, 37; in 1800's, 37-39
Smithsonian Institute, Bureau of Ethnology and establishment of African Museum, 39
Social Darwinism, 38
Social Distance Tests: *see* Tests
Social Interiority: *see* Self-Concept, Black
Social Interaction and School Conformity, 185-186
Social Relations: *see* Racial Interaction or Social Interaction
Sociometric Tests: *see* Tests
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 46
Society of Friends: *see also* Quakers; established black schools, 2
South Carolina: desegregation study in, 206, enacted first Compulsory Ignorance Law, 1740, 17; State College (Orangeburg), racial violence at, 199; study of student-teacher interaction in, 229
South Dakota: Aberdeen, Indian-American educational achievement in, 312, Indian-American Community control of schools in, 318
Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, accreditation standards, 8
Southern Indian Nations, 296
Southern University: Baton Rouge, Louisiana, student violence at, 199; racial discrimination at, 201
Southern Ute Indian Tribe, 309
Spanish Culture, denigration by schools in Southwest, 286
Spanish language, banned in public schools, Texas, 286
Spanish Language Prohibition, effect on Mexican-American self-concept, 294-295
Spanish Language Tests, 289
Spanish-Speaking: *see also* Mexican-Americans; *see also* Puerto Ricans; enrollment in schools, 285-301
Spanish Surname: *see also* Mexican-Americans; enrollment in schools, 285-301
Stanford Achievement Tests: *see* Scholastic Achievement Tests
Stanford Binet: *see* Intelligence Quotient Tests: Standardized
State Governments, North, responsibility for black education, 17
TWO: *see* Schools: Community Controlled, The Woodlawn Organization
Taylor Elementary School, Stockton, California, study of acculturation in Mexican-Americans, 291
Taxes, property, as means of financing education, 29
Teacher: bias against Mexican-Americans, 296-297; discrimination against Chicano students, 301
Teacher attitudes: black, toward desegregation, 228; effect of school desegregation on, 223; effect on academic failure, 221-240; effect on black academic achievement, 231; effect on self-fulfilling prophecy, 221-228; effect on students, 221-240; impact of black passivity on, 223; toward Indian-Americans, 316-317; in interracial classrooms, 213; toward minorities,

221-240; in open-enrollment schools, 228; toward Asian Americans, 223; studies of, 221-240; white toward black academic achievement, 225-226; white, toward desegregation, 228; white, effect on student perception of teacher, 226; white in inner-city schools, 226; white, toward Mexican-Americans, 290-291
Teacher behavior; effect on academic achievement, 295-296; toward black females, 229
Teacher Corps, 222
Teacher Expectations: as enforcer of self-fulfilling prophency, 229-237; of Mexican-Americans, 294; and student achievement, 236-237
Teacher Hiring: at experimental schools, 276-277 in Indian-American schools, 308-319
Teacher Impressions, relationships to student achievement, 229-231
Teacher Orientation Programs, in Indian-American schools, 316-317
Teacher Preference: at community controlled schools, 277-278; for minorities, 91
Teacher Preference: at community controlled schools, 277-278; for minorities, 91
Teacher Salaries: 87-88; black teachers in white schools, 5; legal actions for increases, 1930's, 5
Teacher-Student Interaction, 219-240
Teachers: effect of socioeconomic level of parents on perception of, 269; effect of teacher race on job dissatisfaction, 227; effect of teacher race on student perception, 226-227; effectiveness of teaching style, 230-231; influence on achievement of minority students, 291-292; influence of minority bias by white students, 234; influence on minority students achievement, 232-233; in-service training studies 239-240; isolation from students, 221-222; preparation for desegregation, 239-240; race of and effect on learning in minorities, 237-238; racial bias in student evaluation, 224-227; racial preferences of, 234-235; racial stereotyping, 222-223; residency requirements for, 270; responsiveness to parents, 270; role in desegregated schools, 328; role of, 219-240; segregated by race, 237